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ABSTRACT

I. Sales and Prices of First Folios: A History from 1623 to the Present As a point of departure, Part I summarises the latest work on the costs of producing and distributing the First Folio. It then presents, century by century, a history of Folio sales and prices (with extensive data in appendixes). The history is placed in the context both of Shakespearean studies and events, and of the contemporary world of antiquarian book-sales, including the sales of the other three seventeenth-century Shakespeare Folios. The twentieth-century section includes Henry Folger's purchases of over one-third of the extant copies, with the prices he paid. The last section shows long-term sales and price trends, compares the price trends to a variety of indexes, and considers the effect of inflation.

II. A Bibliographical Model for Describing First Folios, with Descriptions of Selected Copies This presents the model. It then illustrates the model's application by providing bibliographical descriptions of selected copies of the Folio in the UK and all copies in Japan. The primary purpose is to establish a model for eventual use in describing all extant copies.

III. A World Census of First Folios Chapter 4 describes earlier attempts to list copies of the Folio, both before and after Sidney Lee's Census (1902); it then presents the methods and story of my five-year search for copies, and deals with doubtful identifications. Chapter 5 addresses what to count as a copy and, for illustration, examines three uncatalogued copies at the Folger Library. Chapter 6 determines the number and distribution of known copies in 1902 and 1998, showing the geographical migration and the shift from private to public ownership in this century. The final chapter contains the new Census. For each of two hundred and fifteen located copies it gives the confirmed owner/keeper, and for twenty missing copies it gives detailed information to help find them. It records over seventy more copies than in Lee's Census.

The appendix is a survey of facsimiles of the First Folio--fifteen full editions since 1807 and a variety of parts.
It is something to have one.\textsuperscript{1}

\textsuperscript{1} The second and last sentence, following 'I have no intention of selling my First Folio Shakespeare', on a postcard written in 1915 by The Reverend Fulford Adams, country parson, from Weston-Sub-Edge Rectory, Broadway, Worcestershire, to A H Mayhew, bookseller in London, in reply to the latter's solicitation for Adams's copy made at the behest of Henry Folger, President, Standard Oil Company, New York City (Case File 1996, Folger Shakespeare Library).
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This study was prompted by a call for a new census of the Shakespeare First Folio in an article by Paul Werstine in *The Library* in 1989. Speaking of newly discovered press-variants in Folger First Folios, Werstine suggested that still more variants might be located 'in the many other copies scattered throughout the world' and went on to state that 'the number of extant copies and their locations need to be resolved with an up-to-date census'. There had not been a census of the First Folio for nearly a century. In 1902, Sidney Lee made the first attempt to record the location of all copies. Since then, many copies had changed hands, many had migrated and many additional copies had been discovered. There was no reference work recording where these were. Shakespeare scholars, bibliographers, librarians and rare-book specialists both in the UK and the USA confirmed the need for a new census and encouraged the project.

In the course of searching for First Folios, I discovered rich material concerning the history of the book since it left the printing press. Part I, as a complement to the record of where the volumes now are, describes the First Folio's history, starting where Charlton Hinman's *Printing and Proof-Reading* stopped. With the philosophy of *l'histoire du livre* in mind, I have focused on the Folio's sales and price history and in each age viewed this history in the contexts of Shakespeare's contemporary standing and of antiquarian book sales, and, in the twentieth century, in the context of bibliographical scholarship.

The new Census opens up the possibility that one day every copy of the Folio might be described in detail so that scholars and others could know where to find what they needed. At present there is no standard format for presenting this information and no reference work containing it. The information required for such descriptions is so particular, technical and time-consuming to record, that gathering it by such means as a questionnaire sent to owners and librarians is not practicable. A major world-wide project needs to be mounted which allows for visiting the locations of as many Folios as feasible and for obtaining descriptions from a distance where a visit is not feasible or where a local bibliographer is willing to help. Part II paves the way for

---


3 Lee, *Census*. 
such a project by creating a model for describing copies and giving working examples of descriptions. The model meets two needs. The first has to do with format and content. W W Greg pioneered and set the standard for the meticulous description of 'ideal' copies of many different titles in his *Bibliography of English Printed Drama*. In the absence of a ready-made Greg-like model, Part II defines a flexible format and content for the description of copies of a single title in very varied states of condition. It aims to embrace everything that anyone might want to know about a particular volume, from collation and condition of the text to press-variants and provenance. The second need the model meets has to do with gathering the required information through others. Together with sample descriptions, it will serve as a guide to standards of accuracy, consistency and completeness.

Part III starts with the search for copies, defines what to count as a copy, compares the number and distribution of copies at the beginning and end of this century and concludes with the new Census. With the knowledge of where the Folios are and with the aid of the model for describing copies, a world-wide First Folio description project is now ready to be launched. The rich body of data on all the copies will not only be a valuable reference resource, but also enable the telling of a missing part of the Folio's story— from provenance to bindings—to complement the sales and price history in Part I of this work.

---

ABBREVIATIONS and REFERENCES

ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>British Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>century (eg, 17c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>circa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>col(s)</td>
<td>column(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>compiler, compiled by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>edited by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edn</td>
<td>edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed(s)</td>
<td>editor(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esp</td>
<td>especially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. (ll.)</td>
<td>line(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS (S)</td>
<td>manuscript(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N(n)</td>
<td>footnote(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nd</td>
<td>no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. (nos)</td>
<td>number(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>new series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (pp)</td>
<td>page(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev</td>
<td>revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ser</td>
<td>series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-p</td>
<td>title-page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vols</td>
<td>volume(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STERLING

£197 12s. 6d.
(£)197/12/6

£197 2s. 0d.
(£)197/2/-

AUCTION HOUSES

For the firms of Sotheby's and Christie's the single proper name is used since their founding.
COPIES OF THE FIRST FOLIO

Lee 1, etc  The numbered copy in Lee, *Census*\(^5\)
Lee+1, etc  The numbered copy in Lee, 1906
Folger 1, etc  The numbered copy in the Folger Shakespeare Library
Meisei 1, etc  The numbered copy in the Kodama Memorial Library,
               Meisei University
West 1, etc  The numbered copy in the new Census

REFERENCES

Bibliographical reference notation  See Chapter 2, Section A
Text within angle brackets < > in Chapters 3 and 7  Quotation from Lee, *Census*

\(^5\) For ease of reading, Lee’s roman numerals are changed to arabic.
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Third Folio

Mr. William Shakespear’s Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies
(1663, 1664)

TLS

Times Literary Supplement

Wheatley

Henry B Wheatley, Prices of Books, ed Richard Garnett, The
Library Series, iv (1898)

Wilson

F P Wilson, Shakespeare and the New Bibliography, rev and ed
Helen Gardner (Oxford, 1970)

Wing

Donald Wing, comp, Short-title Catalogue of Books: 1641-1700, rev
and ed Timothy J Crist, John L Morrison et al, 2nd edn, 3 vols (New
York, 1982-94)

Winsor

Justin Winsor, A Bibliography of the Original Quartos and Folios of
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Part I: SALES AND PRICES

Chapter 1

Sales and Prices of First Folios:
A History from 1623 to the Present

INTRODUCTION

A 1623: PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION COSTS, AND PUBLICATION PRICES

B 1623-1675: EARLY RECORDS, SALES AND PRICES

C 1676-1699: SALES AND PRICES

D 1700-1799: SALES AND PRICES

E 1800-1899: SALES AND PRICES

F 1900 TO THE PRESENT: SALES AND PRICES

G FIRST FOLIO SALES AND PRICE TRENDS
### APPENDIXES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/P</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/P 1</td>
<td>SALES AND PRICES: RESEARCH COVERAGE AND METHODS FOR THE PERIOD 1676-1699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/P 2</td>
<td>SALES AND PRICES OF THE SECOND, THIRD AND FOURTH FOLIOS 1676-1699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/P 3</td>
<td>SELECTED AUTHORS FROM THE SALES OF RICHARD DAVIS'S STOCK 1686-1688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/P 4</td>
<td>SALES AND PRICES: RESEARCH COVERAGE AND METHODS FOR THE PERIOD 1700-1799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/P 5</td>
<td>SALES AND PRICES OF THE FIRST FOLIO 1700-1799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/P 6</td>
<td>SALES AND PRICES OF THE SECOND, THIRD AND FOURTH FOLIOS 1700-1799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/P 7</td>
<td>PRICES OF THE FOUR FOLIOS 1700-1799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/P 8</td>
<td>PRICES OF OTHER AUTHORS' FOLIOS IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/P 9</td>
<td>SALES AND PRICES OF THE FIRST FOLIO 1800-1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/P 10</td>
<td>SALES AND PRICES OF THE SECOND, THIRD AND FOURTH FOLIOS, AND OF THE FOUR FOLIOS TOGETHER 1800-1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/P 11</td>
<td>FOLGER FIRST FOLIO PURCHASES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/P 12</td>
<td>SALES AND PRICES OF THE FIRST FOLIO 1900 TO THE PRESENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/P 13</td>
<td>SALES AND PRICES OF THE SECOND, THIRD AND FOURTH FOLIOS, AND THE FOUR FOLIOS TOGETHER 1900 TO THE PRESENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLES

(Tables A, B, D, I, J, Q, R, S, T, Y, Z, BB, FF and GG are in the text; the rest are in the appendixes.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Costs and Prices in Units for Each Stage of Production and Distribution for an Average Jacobean Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Costs and Prices per Copy in Shillings and Pence for Each Stage of Production and Distribution for the First Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Sales of the Second, Third and Fourth Folios 1676-1699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Prices of the Four Folios 1676-1699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Prices of Folios of Selected Authors 1686-1688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Extracts from Thomas Payne's Catalogues 1758-1762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Sales and Prices of the First Folio 1700-1799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Sales and Prices of the Second, Third and Fourth Folios 1700-1799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Number of Sales of the Four Folios by Decade in the 1700s with Dates of Shakespeare Editions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Number of Sales of the Four Folios, First and Second Half of the 1700s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Prices of the Four Folios by Decade in the 1700s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Eighteenth-Century Prices of the Four Folios When in the Same Catalogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Folio Prices of Selected Authors on Random Dates 1732-1770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Sales and Prices of the First Folio 1800-1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Sales and Prices of the First Folio 1800-1899, Lee Class I Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Representative Sales and Prices of the Second, Third and Fourth Folios 1800-1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Number of Sales of the First Folio by Decade in the 1800s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Average Price of the First Folio by Decade in the 1800s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Average or Indicative Price of Lee Class I First Folios by Decade in the 1800s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Average Prices of the Four Folios, First and Second Half of the 1800s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Nineteenth-Century Prices of the Four Folios When in the Same Sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Prices of Henry Folger's First Folio Purchases by Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Detailed Record of Sales and Prices of the First Folio 1900 to the Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary Record of Prices of the First Folio by Year, Including Folger Purchases (F), 1900 to the Present

Number of Sales of the First Folio by Decade in the 1900s

Average Price (£000) of the First Folio by Decade in the 1900s

Sales and Prices of the First Folio 1900 to the Present, Lee Class I Only

Average or Indicative Price (£000) of Lee Class I Folios by Decade in the 1900s

Indicative Prices of the Second, Third and Fourth Folios in the Twentieth Century

Twentieth-Century Prices of the Four Folios When Sold Together

New RecordPrices of the First Folio

Prices: First Folios Compared to Luxury Items in the Twentieth Century

Putative Value of a First Folio in 1960 Using Reitlinger’s Multiple

CHARTS

(Chart 1 is in the text of Section G. Charts 2-5 follow the appendixes to Chapter 1.)

1 Sales of First Folios by Decade 1740s-1990s
2 All First Folios: Average Price by Decade 1790s-1850s
3 Class I and Class II-IV First Folios: Individual Prices 1790-1862
4 All First Folios: Average Price by Decade 1860s-1970s
5 Prices: Gutenberg Bibles and First Folios 1793-1978
INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the sales and price history of the Shakespeare First Folio from 1623 to the present. The history is viewed, in the spirit of l'histoire du livre, within related social and economic contexts. In each epoch the amassed data on sales and prices are placed within the contexts of what I call the 'world of Shakespeare' and the 'world of (antiquarian) book sales'. In the twentieth century the context is confined to the world of the First Folio, including its focal role in the development of modern Anglo-American bibliography. To illustrate the influences surrounding and the forces affecting Folio sales and prices, I have chosen a wide variety of contextual topics and themes. These include the costs of producing and distributing the First Folio; early records of the First Folio; the ownership of First Folios through the ages; the comparison of First Folio prices to the prices of its three seventeenth-century successors and to prices of folios of other writers, particularly dramatists; the emergence and ever-widening prevalence of Shakespeare's 'cultural presence'\(^1\) during the eighteenth century; the relationship between the editing of Shakespeare and Folio ownership; the four Folios selling together as a package; the rise of American demand; the prodigious purchasing of Henry Folger; Shakespeare's and the Folio's centennials; and the Folio's price trends over time and how its price relates to contemporary purchasing power.

The history is arranged into five periods—from the First Folio's date of publication to the date of the first recorded English book auction in 1676; the rest of the seventeenth century; then, roughly, the eighteenth, the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries. The last section breaks out of centennial boundaries and looks at long-term trends over periods suggested by the movement of Folio prices.

The kind and amount of sales and price information available differ greatly according to the period; the sources of information also differ greatly. For the first period, the sources are a small number of individual references to early purchases; the amount of information is meagre. For the second period, the sources are book-auction catalogues. Normally they give a precise date and the name of the auctioneer; sometimes, the name of the seller. Occasionally there are prices and buyers added by hand. It is not possible to identify the copy sold as a known copy today. For the eighteenth century, some contemporary comments supplement information from book-auction and book-dealers' catalogues. As the century progresses there is increasing information and it is sometimes possible to identify the copy. For the nineteenth century, Sidney Lee's Census is a useful source for sales and prices; details of vendor, buyer and price can be sought in auctioneers' marked up catalogues; in almost all cases the information is related to an identifiable copy. In this century, the principal sources

---

\(^1\) The term is Jonathan Bate's, *Shakespearean Constitutions—Politics, Theatre, Criticism 1730-1830* (Oxford, 1989), 21.
are Sotheby's and Christie's Catalogues, BAR, ABPC and Rosenbach, Biography. Auctioneers' catalogues give the same details as in the nineteenth century; normally, one can identify the copy among known copies. Most of the quantitative and some of the supportive data are gathered in tables and charts in the appendices, which also give the sources of the data and describe the research methods used to gather them.

A 1623: PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION COSTS, AND PUBLICATION PRICES

A useful point of departure for looking at the publication prices of the First Folio is to consider what it cost to produce and distribute. This subject is expertly covered in detail by Peter Blayney in his booklet on the First Folio and in a subsequent, unpublished lecture. My purpose here is threefold. First, to summarise Blayney's data and present it in a tabular layout to highlight the cost elements and how they relate to each other. Second, to show each cost element in relation to the retail price; in this form the relative cost of each element—whether in percentage or monetary terms—is seen at a glance. Third, to incorporate two important changes which Blayney made after the booklet was published and which he covered in his later lecture. Thus, Table A shows the relationships of costs and prices for each stage of production and distribution of 'an average Jacobean book,' and incorporates the unpublished corrections. The retail price is expressed as one hundred units; accordingly, all the other figures, as they build up through the successive stages, relate to it as percentages. (This is the standard business practice of relating costs, as a percentage, to sales price.) Row 9 + row 8 = row 7; row 7 + row 6 = row 5; and so on. Being in percentages, this table is useful in situations where one has the price or a single cost figure of a book of this time and wants a rough estimate of the other figures.

---

2 See List of Cue Titles immediately preceding this chapter.
3 Blayney, 25-32. This work, The First Folio of Shakespeare, was prepared for the First Folio exhibition at the Folger Shakespeare Library, 1 April to 21 September 1991.
4 'The First Folio of Shakespeare' (Unpublished lecture, version of March 1993). Peter Blayney generously gave me a copy.
5 Ibid, 2.
Table A

Costs and Prices in Units for Each Stage of Production and Distribution for an Average Jacobean Book

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lines 2, 4, 8 and 9--Blayney, 26</td>
<td>Retailer's Price for an unbound volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 6--Blayney, Lecture, 2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 6--Blayney, Lecture, 2</td>
<td>Retailer’s Mark-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Each of [the middlemen] expected to mark up his costs by about 50% to cover his overheads and profit’</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 6--Blayney, Lecture, 2</td>
<td>Publisher’s Wholesale Price = Retailer’s cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The publisher marked up his own costs (which included the paper and the copy) [50%] when selling the book at wholesale rates’</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 6--Blayney, Lecture, 2</td>
<td>Publisher’s Mark-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The printer paid the compositors and pressmen’</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 6--Blayney, Lecture, 2</td>
<td>Publisher’s Total Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘We should expect the remaining [67%] to be divided not quite half and half... about [30%] for the copy’</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 6--Blayney, Lecture, 2</td>
<td>Printer’s Price = Publisher’s cost for Composition and Printing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Each of [the middlemen] expected to mark up his costs by about 50% to cover his overheads and profit’</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 6--Blayney, Lecture, 2</td>
<td>Printer’s Mark-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The printer paid the compositors and pressmen’</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 6--Blayney, Lecture, 2</td>
<td>Cost of Compositors and Pressman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B shows the costs and prices in shillings and pence for each stage of production and distribution for the First Folio. The basis for each of the figures is as follows. A retail price of 15/- for an unbound copy is consistent with contemporary records, as shown in Section B below. The normal mark-up for the retailer was 50%. The wholesale price could not exceed about 10/-. This was the ceiling William Jaggard the printer could charge fellow members of the Stationers’ Company in order to conform to a Company ordinance of 1598. The normal mark-up for the publisher was 50%. Thus the publishers’ cost was about 6/8. Blayney indicates that the paper cost about 2/2 and the copy about 2/0. Accordingly, the printing could have cost the

---

6 In the lecture Blayney makes two important changes to what he said in the booklet. The first is in the distribution of the publisher’s costs between paper plus copy and printing—from about 50/50 in the booklet to about 63/37 in the lecture. The other is to take account of the fact that the cost of printing the Folio was higher than the cost of printing ‘an average Jacobean book’ (Lecture, 2).

7 Presumably other variable costs, such as ink, are covered by this mark-up.

8 Blayney (28) has this date as ‘1599’, which he corrects in his lecture.

9 Obviously, the size of the edition is an important determinant of unit cost. Blayney challenges Charlton Hinman’s conclusion that 1,200 copies of the Folio were printed: ‘To have printed more than a thousand copies of a book for which the potential demand could only be guessed, and which was by far the most expensive book that had ever been offered to the play-buying public, would have been foolhardy. Blount was too experienced a publisher to risk that kind of gamble. . . . It is highly unlikely that more than 750 copies were printed’ (Lecture, 2, cited above). Blayney presents the same argument in his Introduction to the new edition of the Norton Facsimile (1996), concluding ‘since the book sold out in nine years, the actual figure was probably closer to 500 than to 1,200. A guess of 750 copies seems realistic’ (xxxiii). W W Greg summarises the various estimates that scholars have
publishers only 2/6. Blayney shows, however, that due especially to the high cost of composing two columns of the relatively small pica type per page, the cost to the printer must have been close to 4/-.

He concludes that Isaac Jaggard persuaded his father to undertake the printing at cost, for it is unlikely that the other publishers of the volume (Blount, Smethwick and Aspley) would be willing to take the high risk associated with the Folio publication without the expectation of at least a normal mark-up—a risk they would all be aware was the greater because the volume’s content was drama. Jaggard, père et fils, would fact be rewarded with the publisher’s mark-up. Figures approximating to those in Table B best fit the known facts about printing and publishing costs and the likely motivations of the five men involved in a risky venture.

| Table B
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs and Prices per Copy in Shillings and Pence for Each Stage of Production and Distribution for the First Folio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sources: Lines 1-5—Blayney, 26 and 28 Lines 6-9—Blayney, Lecture, 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1 Retail Price (unbound)  
‘We can be reasonably certain . . . that an unbound copy would normally have cost 15s. in London’ (26) | 15/- |
| 2 Retailers’ Mark-up  
‘Each of [the middlemen] expected to mark up his costs by about 50% to cover his overheads and profit’ (26) | 5/- |
| 3 Publishers’ Wholesale Price  
‘We can be reasonably certain . . . that it was sold wholesale at 10s. to other members of the Stationers’ Company’ (26) | 10/- |
| 4 Publishers’ Mark-up  
‘Each of the publishers would have made about 3s. 4d. from each copy sold wholesale’ (28) | 3/4 |
| 5 Publishers’ Total Cost  
‘We can be reasonably certain that a single Folio cost the publishers about 6s. 8d.’ (26) | 6/8 |
| 6 The paper cost about 2/2 and the copy about 2/- | 4/2 |
| 7 Printer’s Price = Publishers’ Cost for Composition and Printing | 2/6 |
| 8 The printer must have foregone his normal 50% mark-up | -/- |
| 9 Cost of Compositors and Pressmen | 2/6 |

The cost of a bound volume depended on the type of binding. Blayney concludes his coverage of the costs as follows: ‘The real answer to the question of how much the

made concerning the size of the edition: Steevens c. 250; Lee c. 600, and later 800 or 900; Henry Guppy c. 1,000; A W Pollard c. 500, ‘though he was prepared to welcome a higher figure’; Willoughby, basing his estimate on Greg’s in 1924, c. 1,000 (‘The First Folio and its Publishers’ in Gollancz, 129-156 (156)); and Greg himself, referring back to Willoughby and his supporting evidence, ‘approaching 1,000’ (Greg, 455-56). D F McKenzie, ‘Printers of the Mind: Some Notes on Bibliographical Theories and Printing-House Practices’, SB, 22 (1969), 1-75, offers a rich context in which to consider edition size. Though he does not directly address the question of the size of the First Folio edition, he challenges other Hinman conclusions concerning the printing of the Folio. Blayney in the Introduction to the new Norton Facsimile also challenges other Hinman conclusions, in particular concerning the proof-reading of the Folio.
Folio cost, therefore, is a range rather than a price. In London, unbound copies would usually have cost 15s. while bound copies would have cost about 16s.-17s. in limp forel, 17s.-18s. 6d. in forel-covered boards, and about £1 in plain calf” (Blayney, 32).10 The figures of 15/- and £1 are consistent with extant records of prices in contemporary documents, as shown in the next section.

B 1623-1675: EARLY RECORDS, SALES AND PRICES

Early records of the First Folio are hard to find. For example, I have been unable to trace any link between the subscribers to John 's Guide into the Tongues and buyers or owners or sellers of the First Folio. One might have thought that the 1617 list of Minsheu subscribers, ten folio-columns long, starting with the King, Queen, Prince, then the Bishops, then ‘The Lord Chanc: Sir Fr: Bacon’ and many other office-holders including “Doctor Dunne Chaplaine to the K. Majest.” (recto, col e), and continuing with many names in Oxford and Cambridge and so on, would include names readily linked with a book containing the collected plays of the best-known dramatist published only six years later.11 Given that the First Folio presumably sold out within a decade, some of the Minsheu subscribers surely must have been among its purchasers, but I have not identified any. There is at least one direct link, though, between Minsheu and the First Folio. ‘The Earle of Mountgomery’ was a Minsheu subscriber (verso, col a) and a dedicatee of the Folio.

I also searched Books in Cambridge Inventories. ‘Shakespeare’—even by means of all the Quartos and both the first two Folios—failed to gain entry to the author/title catalogue of around 3,000 authors and nearly 20,000 books in Cambridge inventories of people who died from 1536 to 1660. Seven of the listed book owners, whose inventories were ‘presented for probate in the Vice-Chancellor’s Court at Cambridge’ died after 1623; none of their inventories recorded a Shakespeare Folio.12

---

10 The Sr. for a plain calf binding compares with 3/6d. for binding Raleigh's History of the World ‘in calf with fillets’ at about the same time (Francis R Johnson, ‘Notes on English Retail Book-prices, 1550-1640’, Library, 5/5 (1950), 83-112 (91, n 1)). Johnson is quoting a 1619 broadside list of prices of binding. He notes that Raleigh’s History is ‘a folio as large or slightly larger than the first folio’. Johnson, who spent many years collecting prices of books of this period, believes the price of £1 is correct for the First Folio ‘in a simple calf binding’ (91).

11 John Minsheu, The Guide into the Tongues (1617). The subscriber's list (in two typesettings) is present at the beginning of the volumes in the British Library with shelf-marks 629.m.15/1-2 and 505.kk.10. It is the first subscription list in a British book (David Pearson, Provenance Research in Book History: A Handbook (1994), 181).

Since Donne took orders in 1615 and presumably focused thereafter on ecclesiastical works, it is hardly surprising to find no evidence of his owning any Shakespeare in Geoffrey Keynes, A Bibliography of John Donne (Oxford, 1973), eg, 258. An indirect link with Donne is that he shares Droeshout as his portraitist (Arthur M Hind, Engraving in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1952-64), 11, 354).

The contemporary attitude towards drama goes some way towards explaining the absence of records. A general point of view is given by Sears Jayne, speaking of English renaissance library catalogues:

It is true that library catalogues do not generally record the ephemeral literature of the period: the broadside, the cony-catching pamphlet, or even the immortal ephemera such as Shakespeare’s plays. Such materials were all excluded almost as a matter of principle from most large libraries. Spenser and Elyot were admissible; Shakespeare and Greene were not.\[13\]

A particular point of view is given by Thomas Bodley, an authority of the age when it came to deciding what to include in an institutional library. He was very hesitant to admit books of plays. He wrote in 1612, when Shakespeare’s plays were already famed and many Shakespeare Quartos already needed a shelf, to Thomas James, the first keeper of his library: he could ‘see no good reason to alter [his] opinion, for excluding suche bookes, as almanackes, plaies, & an infinit number, that are daily printed, of very vnworthy maters . . . Happely some plaies may be worthy the keeping : but hardly one in fortie’.\[14\] His concern was “the harme that the scandal will bring vnto the Librarie, when it shal be giuen out, that we stuffe it full of baggage bookes’, and he concludes ‘the more I thinke vpon it, the more it doth distast me, that suche kinde of bookes, should be vouchesafed a rowme, in so noble a Librarie’ (222).

Heidi Hackel, in “Rowme” of Its Own: Printed Drama in Early Libraries’, explores at length the contemporary attitude towards playbooks.\[15\] She suggests that Bodley’s opinions were not universal and may have been exceptional. Even so, I have found no early reference to the First Folio in a library catalogue or inventory. No doubt, in some cases, playbooks entered a library, but not its catalogue. Hackel makes this point in the context of the acquisitions cataloguing in 1640 by John Rous, the Bodleian’s second librarian; Rous ‘effectively reverses Bodley’s exclusion of riffe raffe books’ in what he selected from Robert Burton’s bequest to the Bodleian: ‘Although the Bodleian had yielded some “rowme” to drama by 1640, it neither acknowledged the acquisitions fully [in the Benefactors’ Register] nor made them accessible [through the catalogue] to readers’. In summary, though Jayne, in the passage quoted above, does not distinguish between ‘entry into a library’ from ‘entry into a catalogue’, one explanation for the absence of early records of the First Folio is that some persons would not admit playbooks into their library; another is that even if the Folio entered a library, it might be omitted from the catalogue, the benefactors’ register or a probate inventory. Such was the common attitude towards playbooks.

---


\[15\] Heidi Brayman Hackel, ““Rowme” of Its Own: Printed Drama in Early Libraries’, in John D Cox and David Scott Kastan, edd, *A New History of Early English Drama* (New York, 1997), 113-30 (121). The two following quotations are respectively from p 120 and p 121.
The earliest known record is an advertisement. The English language supplements (1622-26) to the twice-yearly catalogues, which the Stationers' Company published for the Frankfurt Fair, advertised the First Folio in Autumn 1623 (and again in Spring 1625).\(^6\) Forty years ago Greg (454-55) could cite only one reference to ‘external evidence’ concerning the publication price of the First Folio, and that ‘evidence’ is not identifiable today. This reference is the often-quoted one by Steevens which I cover below together with other references which lack full or identifiable or extant evidence of the publication price. Fortunately, there are at least two clear records of early purchases to which one can point, each with a price, one with a date.

The first is a manuscript record on the fly-leaf of a Folio. As Blayney says, ‘Comparatively few buyers or booksellers wrote purchase prices in books at that date. Those who did so usually wrote them at the top of a flyleaf, and very few surviving Folios have intact flyleaves’ (28). On the blank fly-leaf of Folger 71 appears: ‘Oxon: Tho: Longe Pretium 15 s’ (reproduced in Blayney, 28).\(^7\) Blayney points out that Folger 71 ‘belongs to the second issue . . . so the date of purchase was probably November 1623’ (28). The fifteen shillings tallies with the price in Table B for an unbound copy.

The second record of an early retail purchase is in the account book of Sir Edward Dering of Surrenden Hall, Kent. On 5 December 1623 he purchased two copies for £2:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{2 volumes of J Shakespear’s playes} & \quad \text{--02/00/00.}^8
\end{align*}
\]

At £1 each these volumes were presumably bound.

---


\(^7\) If the purchaser was an Oxford graduate the more likely of two possible candidates was Thomas Longe who matriculated in 1589, received his BA in 1594-95, was a fellow of All Souls’ College in 1600, and was vicar of Eynsham, Oxfordshire, in 1617 (Joseph Foster, ed. *Alumni Oxoniensae: The Members of the University of Oxford 1500-1714*, 4 vols (Oxford, 1891), III, 937).

\(^8\) Interestingly this entry is followed by: ‘Jhonson’s playes -------00/09/00’ and preceded by ‘seeing a play ------00/01/06’ (25). As Blayney points out, ‘The “J” before Shakespeare’s name is not a mistaken initial: Dering apparently began to write the name “Jhonson” in the wrong entry’. The account book is preserved in the Kent Archives Office, Maidstone, Kent. These entries, which are reproduced by Blayney (25), are items 4.547:1 and 2 in R J Fehrenbach and E S Leedham-Green, eds, *Private Libraries in Renaissance England: A Collection and Catalogue of Tudor and Early Stuart Book-Lists*, 3 vols (Binghamton, NY, & Marlborough, England, 1992-94), 1, 256-57, where they can be seen in the context of Sir Edward Dering’s life and library. As the editors point out, ‘It is assumed . . . that the entry represents two copies of the folio’ (256-57).

There has been speculation (eg, Blayney, 25) that the Folio in the Padua University Library, which has seventeenth-century manuscript notes on leaves of *Measure for Measure*, *The Winter’s Tale* and *Macbeth*, is one of the Dering volumes used for performances at Surrenden. G Blakemore Evans’s study of these leaves (*Shakespearean Prompt-Books of the Seventeenth Century*, 7 vols (Charlottesville, VA, 1960-89), 1 (1960) and 2 (1963)) says the case for the Dering association ‘hangs essentially on one name and two initials and cannot be considered conclusive, [but] at least persuasive’ (1, 10). When I inspected this volume and the documents stored with it, on a visit to Padua in 1994, I found nothing further to support or discredit the Dering provenance.
The first of four other early records, or possible records, which can be mentioned is more frustrating than helpful. Tantalisingly, a manuscript notation in the top right corner of the title-page of Folger 10 cuts off before giving the price. Folger Cat RLIN records it as ""Ja: Hai . . ." (mutilated) 'pretium: . . .' (mutilated)." My own close inspection of this yielded the following note: 'Ja: Ha.1 . . ./pretium. . .'--i.e., a period after 'Ha.', no dot over '1', 'pretium' on a second line with its 'p' under the 'H', and a period after 'pretium.', with the corner of the leaf torn off just above the '1' and just to the right of 'Pretium.' The significant difference is the absence of the dot over the '1'. It is just possible that this '1' could have been the start of '15/-' or even '1L', though this interpretation would require the 'pretium' to follow the numeral, instead of precede it as it does in the first example cited above. The early price of this volume is further complicated by inconsistent statements by Lee including the prices of £3/15/- and £3/0/-.

As the source of these prices is unknown, they can carry little weight. It seems best to follow Greg who, noting the inconsistency between the Census and Lee, 1924, dismisses the price information in the latter as 'too vague to be of much help' (455, n 3).

The second record is a double mention by George Steevens, his follow-up mention cancelling his first. In the 1793 edition of The Plays, he says 'An ancient quarto was sold for six-pence; and the folios 1623 and 1632, when first printed, could not have been rated higher than at ten shillings each.' He gives no evidence for this assertion. In the 1803 edition, he corrects himself: 'I have since discovered, from an ancient MS. note in a copy of the folio of 1623, belonging to Messieurs White, booksellers in Fleet Street, that the original price of this volume was--one pound.' We cannot point today to the Folio Steevens saw.

The third is a reference in William Jaggard's Shakespeare Bibliography:

The published price was twenty shillings. This information is kindly supplied by Mr. R. C. Jackson (originator of the idea of the Bankside national memorial to Sh-- at Southwark). He discovered it at Dulwich, on a letter . . . dated 30th Nov., 1623, the very week of publication . . . from Wm. Cartwright to Edward

---

19 Folger Cat RLIN, DCFG91-B2204. My inspection of this title-page corner was prompted by Peter Blayney who, I believe, is dissatisfied with the reading recorded in Folger Cat RLIN. This valuable catalogue was newly prepared, 1991-92, by Donald Farren.
20 Sidney Lee says: 'The copy seems to have been purchased by a member of the Sheldon family in 1628, five years after publication. There is a note in a contemporary hand which says it was bought for 3L 15s., a somewhat extravagant price. The entry further says that it cost three score pounds of silver, words that I cannot explain' (Lee, 1898, 309, n 2). Inconsistently, Lee says in his Census for copy 20: 'acquired c 1650 by Ralph Sheldon' and gives no price. Compounding his inconsistency, in 1924 he says: 'It was purchased near the date of publication at the then high price of £3 [sic] by one William Sheldon' (Lee, 1924, 86). Folger Cat RLIN for copy 10 makes no mention of '3L 15s.,' or 'three score pounds of silver', or '£3'. The leather binding could not have accounted for a high price in the 1620s, for it was done for the son (it bears the 'Ralph Sheldon arms stamped on upper and lower covers'--Folger Cat RLIN) and is therefore later (unless of course the son adorned his father's binding with his own arms).
21 The Plays of William Shakespeare, ed Samuel Johnson and George Steevens, 15 vols (1793), i, 449.
Alleyn, founder of the College. Cartwright was an intimate friend and guest of Alleyn's from 1617 onwards. The memorandum runs:

‘Paid a sover-in for Shaksper's booke of Plaies.’

Unfortunately, I have been unable to substantiate this reference. The catalogues of the Dulwich College Library do not list the Cartwright letter; on visits to Dulwich I was unable to locate it; the curator kindly searched and found no trace. In addition to lacking a verifiable source, this record gives other clues for questioning its reliability. From the OED it is clear that by 1623 the sovereign was worth 'only 10 s. or 11 s.'--internally inconsistent with Jaggard's 'twenty shillings'; the spelling of 'sover-in' is odd; Jaggard describes the record as a 'memorandum' found 'on', not in, Cartwright's letter—that is, it could have been added any time after 30 November 1623; the 'booke of Plaies' is not incontrovertibly a First Folio (it could be a bound copy of quartos).

Finally, the fourth reference is to the exchange of a First Folio in the account book of John Buxton in about 1627. This is given in a recent article by David McKitterick, one of the thrusts of which is to explore 'the retail cost of books in the context of other costs'. Buxton was born in 1608, went as a student to Gray's Inn in 1626, married in 1627 and purchased a First Folio before he was twenty. He frequented the theatre and before he died in 1660 had formed a considerable library, having purchased perhaps fifty plays (typically at 6d) (207). From 1627 to 1631, he kept detailed records of his expenditures (190-91). McKitterick reproduces the 167 items under Buxton's heading 'For my library' (most, but not all, of the books are identified). Item 7 is: 'p d for the changing of Shakespheares works for on[e] that is perfect 0 6 0' (215). (This little extract raises some fascinating questions and speculations. For example, to what extent was the volume, which he presumably gave in exchange, damaged by four years of reading? If the replacement volume was 'perfect', did he buy it from one of the original publishing consortium? If so, then the edition cannot yet have sold out; if he bought it second-hand, then it might have done so.) The six shillings Buxton paid tells us nothing about the market value of a First Folio because we do not know what he had paid for his original volume. However, assuming his total outlay for the perfect copy

---

23 William Jaggard, Shakespeare Bibliography: A Dictionary of Every Known Issue of the Writings of our National Poet (Stratford-upon-Avon, 1911), 495. Cartwright was an actor, and later, during the Interregnum, a bookseller. The inventory of his possessions (1687)—given in E A J Honigmann and Susan Brock, Playhouse wills 1558-1642: An edition of wills by Shakespeare and his contemporaries in the London theatre (Manchester and New York, 1993)—contains 'Shakespears -- plaies imperfect' (240) and 'old edition of Shakespear' (242). None of 'the testamentary arrangements of one hundred and thirty-five persons connected with the London theatre in Shakespeare's time' (26), in Playhouse wills, bequeathed a Shakespeare Folio. Tantalisingly, the will of Elizabeth Condell, widow of Henry Condell, who still had shares in 'the Globe, and fryers' (183) when she died, gives a certain Thomas Seaman 'all my bookes' (184). One can only speculate what books and whether any manuscripts accompanied them.

24 I showed this reference to Peter Blayney. His doubts concerning its authenticity are expressed in the rest of the paragraph.

was in the region of 15/- to £1, depending on binding, we can get an idea of what this relatively well-to-do but not opulently rich man chose to purchase for similar amounts. At the Stourbridge fair in September 1629, for setting up home in Norfolk with his wife, he bought among many other items a frying pan for 4/-, a close stool and a pan for 9/-, a preserving pan for 12/-, a brass chafing dish and chafier for 16/6, a baking pan for 18/-, four skillets for £1 and one dozen stools and one round table for £1/15/6 (200-03). Such was 'the context of choice' (188), to use McKitterick's phrase, for a lover of books and drama in the 1620s.

These last four references do not add much to our knowledge of the publication price. We can however be satisfied that the prices in the first two records cited accord perfectly with the cost and price structures built up by Blayney.

After 1623 I have found no price for the sale of a First Folio until 1687 or 1688 (see Section C below).^26 However, two Second Folio prices are indicative. Mary Elizabeth Bohannon quotes the bill of Richard Whitaker, London bookseller, to Sir Thomas Barrington of Essex, 20 December 1637: 'Shakespeares Works 00--18--[0]6'.^27 The bill does not give the edition, but the author concludes that the volume is a new, bound Second Folio. Francis R Johnson notes 'in October of 1638, a price of 22s.' was paid by the Earl of Huntingdon for a Second Folio.^28 He adds that the Huntingdon volume was probably 'bound more elaborately' than the Barrington volume and concludes that a 'Second Folio, unbound, sold for 14 s. to 15 s.' (92).

There are quite a number of records of seventeenth-century ownership,^29 but few records of sales. In his Census Lee records sales or possible sales (or rather purchases) in the following years (his copy numbers are in parentheses): 1623 (51 and 134A), c. 1623 (46), c. 1630 (47 and 131), c. 1640 (91), c. 1650 (20) and c. 1660 (19). Consistent with his scholarly practice, in no case does Lee cite the source of his information. In addition, there is the often-mentioned sale by the Bodleian of its First Folio to the bookseller Richard Davis when the Third Folio was published in 1664.^^

---

^26 On an original T4A1 in the copy of the Folio in Oriel College Library, Oxford, is an autograph, 'July First 1652/Tho: Madison', followed by some notes and figure calculations having to do with a debt and its payment. It seems unlikely that any of the figures refers to the book in which they are written. In this context Peter Blayney commented that 'Financial calculations are among the more common forms of jotting found on blank endpapers, and the notes you describe sound like a fairly typical example' (Letter, 6 July 1994).


^29 Lee records seventeenth-century ownership in his Census for copies 18, 19, 20, 28, 46, 47, 51, 52, 53, 74, 78, 79, 91, 124, 130, 131, 141, 142 and 134A. In addition, see my note, 'Two Early Gifts of the First Folio' (Library, 6/17 (1995), 270-71), for two owners in the 1620s: the Vicars Choral Library at Hereford Cathedral and the Bodleian Library, both of which are now lost; and Augustine Vincent, herald and author of The Discoverie of Errors, printed at the same time as the First Folio, who was given his volume by his friend William Jaggard (Folger copy 1).

^30 See, for example, Lee, 1906, 20-22. The volume was restored to the Bodleian in 1906. An interesting comment on which plays were most read in the mid-seventeenth century is made in Bodleian Quarterly Record, 2, no.13 (1917) (Oxford, 1920) from an examination of this volume: 'Careful investigation of wear shows that the most widely read play was Romeo and Juliet, the next Julius Caesar, then the Tempest, Henry IV Part I, Macbeth, and Cymbeline' (26).
The absence of sales records seems clearly less due to their loss than to the paucity of Folio traffic. Steevens attests to the scarcity of First Folios in the middle years of the seventeenth century: ‘Before the year 1649 they were so scarce, that (as Mr. Malone has observed) King Charles I. was obliged to content himself with a folio 1632, at present in my possession’. Both Steevens and Malone believed it was the non-availability of a First Folio, rather than his preference for a more recent edition, which caused the King to acquire a Second Folio. Undoubtedly, the Civil War and Commonwealth, Puritan attitudes and the mid-century eclipse of Shakespeare (one commentator calls 1659 ‘the nadir of Shakespeare’s posthumous history’) largely account for the absence of Folio sales during these middle years.

C 1676-1699: SALES AND PRICES

After the early records of Folio sales covered in the previous section there is a gap until 1687--as long as twenty-seven years after the Restoration and eleven years after the first book auction in England in 1676. Once auctions began, they quickly became frequent. Munby and Coral, in British Book Sale Catalogues, record thirteen sales in the 1670s, 157 in the 1680s and 237 in the 1690s. Another measure of the rapid rise in the trade of books is that seventy-four libraries were sold in the first decade of auctions. Given this amount of activity, one might expect the First Folio to appear frequently in the auction room. One’s expectation is bolstered by the fact that there would have been an increased demand for plays after the Restoration, and that owners (as exemplified by the Bodleian) would trade in their ‘obsolete’ First Folios when purchasing one of the later and apparently better Folios. It is all the more surprising then that in the quarter century following 1676 I have come across only five sales of the First Folio. My research coverage and methods are described in Appendix S/P 1. Two of the sales I found were in the eighties and three in the nineties.

---

31 Plays, 1793, 1, 446, n 6.  
33 William Cooper’s catalogue for 14 February 1687, p 13, gives a list of persons whose libraries had been sold at auction since the first book auction. This was of the library of D L Seaman on 31 October 1676, at which Cooper himself was the auctioneer. The Cooper catalogues can be found, by their dates, through Munby and Coral.  
34 Lawler mentions two First Folios, those in the sales of May 1687 (p 43) and March 1688 (p 102), but no others.  
35 9 May 1687 BL, SC 923; Bodleian, Wood E 20.  
27 May 1690: BL, SC 1036 (17), SC 922 (3); Bodleian, Wood E 22.  
23 May 1695: BL, SC 1038 (2); SC 1038 (21).  
13 February 1699: BL, SC 946 (12); SC 922 (7); SC 1037 (The last is not in Munby and Carol. They are in error in saying that SC 890 also refers to the catalogue of this Millington sale.)
9 May 1687. The auctioneer was probably William Cooper. Although the title-page does not say he was, his name appears first among those from whom the catalogue could be obtained. Lawler also made this supposition (42). The auction was of 'the several Libraries of the Honorable Sir William Coventry, and the Honorable Mr. Henry Coventry, Sometime Secretary of State to King Charles II 36 . . . To be sold by Auction, at the late Dwelling-house of Mr. Secretary Coventry, at the upper end of the Hay-market, Peccadilly [sic]'. The volume appears under 'English in Folio', lot 43: 'William Shakespears Works [Lond.] 1623'.

12 March 1688. The auctioneer was Edward Millington. The auction was of the 'Books . . . contained in the library of a Learned, and Eminent Citizen of London, Sometime-Since Deceased . . . To be sold at Auction . . . St Pauls Churchyard'. The volume appears under 'Miscellanies, viz. History, Philology, etc. in Folio', lot 201: 'Shakespears Comedies, Histories and Tragedies 1623'.

27 May 1690. The auctioneer is not given. The auction was of the 'English part of the library of the late Duke of Lauderdale. 37 . . . To be sold at Sams Coffee-House in Ave-Mary Lane near Ludgate-Street'. The volume appears under 'English Divinity, History and Miscellany, Folio', lot 199: 'Will. Shakespears Commedies, Histories and Tragedies --- Lond. 1623'.

23 May 1695. The auctioneer was again Edward Millington. The auction was of the library of 'Rev. Doct. V. D. Jo. Scott© Londinens. defuncti' to be sold at Roll's Auction House in Petty-Canon-Hall in Petty-Canon-Alley. The volume appears in the English section of the sale under 'Miscellanies in Folio', lot 145: 'Shakespears Comedies, Histories and Tragedies - - 1623'. One copy of the catalogue in the British Library (SC 1038 (2)) has added margins, and records prices and buyers in manuscript. Unfortunately, the recording stops at lot 142.

13 February 1699. The auctioneer was yet again Edward Millington. The auction was of the libraries of Skinner and Hampden, to be sold at Temple-Change Coffee-House in Fleet Street. The Folio is from the Skinner library: on page 32 of the catalogue there is a printed note indicating the end of the Skinner Library, and the Folio appears on page 26. The volume appears under 'English books Divinity, History, Etc.', lot 89: 'Shakespear's Plays and Poems - - 1620'. The date, though erroneous, seems to imply that this is a First Folio. If so, the 'poems' must be the preliminary verses. Misprints of dates in early

36 I do not know which brother owned the Folio or whether he purchased or inherited it. Drostieot engraved a portrait of their father Lord Coventry, Lord Keeper (d 1640). Both Sir William (16287-86) and Henry (1619-86) were involved in public affairs. Sir William, concerned with the Navy, is the Coventry frequently mentioned by Pepys. They were joined not only in their year of death and the sale of their libraries; the two also joined forces in Parliament and 'practically led the House', their paired performance being celebrated by Marvell:

While Hector Harry steers by Will the Witt (1667)

(DNB, xii, (1887), 357-58 and 363-64). The Marvell quotation has been corrected, using George deF Lord, ed, Andrew Marvell: The Complete Poems (1993), 161.

37 John Maitland (1616-82), first Duke of Lauderdale was active in public affairs, especially Anglo-Scottish affairs, and came to have great influence on Charles II. DNB gives no information that directly connects him with Shakespeare or drama (DNB, xxxv (1893), 360-67). He was known, however, for his learning and scholarship (Janet Ing Freeman, The Postmaster of Ipswich: William Stevenson Fitch, Antiquary and Thief (1997), 18-19).

38 John Scott (1639-95), rector of London churches, published sermons and several books on religion. There is nothing in DNB which directly connects him with Shakespeare or drama (DNB, li (1897), 41).
catalogues are quite common. The price paid was: '0-18-0', and the purchaser was ‘Mr Frasier’.

The vendors of the five First Folios above included a knight or a former Secretary of State, ‘a Learned, and Eminent Citizen’, a Duke, and a Reverend Doctor. If one adds to these vendors those owners in the seventeenth century (as a whole) whose position is given in Lee’s Census, one finds one Earl, one Lord, one Bishop, one Colonel, two Baronets, one Knight, four untitled men (one of whom was a lawyer), one Mrs and one Miss or Mrs. With the exception of William Congreve (see the following paragraph), there are no literati. I have found no First Folio owner among the following: Bacon, Donne, Herbert, Coke, Burton, Suckling, Drummond, Milton, Butler, Browne, Walton, Aubrey, Dryden, Pepys, Waller and Evelyn. Given Jonson’s profession, interests, financial means, and involvement with the Folio through the contribution of his poem ‘To the Reader’, one might have expected him to be an owner, but there is no record. He was perhaps in no book-buying mood when the Folio appeared; about a month earlier his library had been destroyed by fire.

The headings under which the Folio is placed in catalogues give a clue as to how it was regarded—for example, on one occasion under ‘Miscellanies, viz. History, Philology, etc. in Folio’, on another it can only be under the ‘Etc.’ in ‘English books Divinity, History, Etc.’, and on yet another the First Folio, which we are accustomed to seeing referred to in reverent terms, appears under ‘Miscellanies in Folio’. At the same time, the organisation of auction catalogues reflects the values of the age and by inference the way Shakespeare’s drama was viewed. Latin/folio/theology books come first; vernacular/smaller formats/other subjects follow. If a catalogue contains books in languages other than Latin and English, such as French or Italian, the latter come before the English. After theology, other subjects include Medicine, Law and Philology, but Literature, let alone Drama, does not occur as a subject. Given the veneration accorded Shakespeare today, it is striking to find his collected plays bundled under such headings as ‘Miscellanies’ and ‘Etc.’

One relationship I shall look at in each subsequent period is that between editing the plays and owning a First Folio—mentioned here only to make the point that in the seventeenth century no such relationship yet existed. The closest one comes is the connection between drama, the theatre and a copy of the Folio evidenced in the volume recently acquired by Meisei University; this contains the signatures of Charles Killigrew and William Congreve and marginal notes by Congreve.

To establish some kind of context within which to view the First Folio information assembled above, I have noted sales of the other Shakespeare Folios for the same

---

39 Jackson Campbell Boswell, A Catalogue of the Remains of John Milton's Library, and An Annotated Reconstruction of Milton's Library (New York & London, 1975), 223, lists the First Folio with '?', meaning 'a questionable inclusion, an association copy, or a fatuous attribution' and the Second with '*', meaning there is 'a possibility' Milton owned it (x).

40 A N L Munby, The Libraries of English Men of Letters (1964), 6. This lecture covers the books of most of the authors referred to in this paragraph.
period. There were eight sales of the Second Folio, twelve of the Third (six of the 1663 imprint and six of the 1664), and thirty of the Fourth (including three in the year of its publication). In addition, there were three Folio sales with no date of publication and I assume they were not First Folios. This gives a total of fifty-three sales of the three later Folios. Table C in Appendix S/P 2 contains the details.

After viewing most of the auction catalogues for the last quarter of the century, I have the impression that Shakespeare’s Folios appeared in the sale-room less frequently than the folios of other writers, especially Jonson, Cowley, Spenser, and Chaucer. To test this impression, I kept track of the occurrences of other literary folios in a sample at the Bodleian. There were six sales of Cowley’s Works (various editions), three of Jonson’s (two editions), three of Spenser’s, three of Chaucer’s, two of Davenant’s (two editions), and one each of Beaumont and Fletcher’s, Killigrew’s Four Plays and Sidney’s Arcadia. (Also, I noted six sales of Favyn’s Theatre of Honour and Knighthood (1623), the First Folio’s companion volume in the press-room.) The conclusion is tentative, but the impression remains that Shakespeare’s Folios went through the sale-room at the end of the seventeenth century less frequently than the folios of other leading literary figures. If true, what combination of forces accounts for it—the number of copies extant, the number and dates of editions, the inclination not to sell, the level of demand, etc—I do not hazard a guess.

If records of sales in this period are rare, records of prices are rarer. They may also suffer from inaccuracy; for example, Henry B Wheatley cites a case where the prices in two different catalogues ‘did not always tally exactly’. Conclusions can therefore be only tentative. I have come across only two First Folio prices in this quarter century. The first is in Lawler. Speaking of this period he says ‘The first folio Shakespeare produced 14s.’ The second price is the 18/- paid by Mr Frasier in the 13 February 1699 Skinner and Hampden sale cited above. (As noted there, the date ‘1620’ and the word ‘poems’ reduce certainty that this is a First Folio.) Happily, a copy of the catalogue for this sale in the British Library (SC 1037) has a full record of prices and buyers added by hand. This thin volume is a fascinating document. It is interleaved and has wide additional margins pasted in. It gives buyers and prices in the margins and notations concerning buyers and lot numbers on the interleaves. We can therefore see how the Folio fares in the same sale compared to other literary volumes.

But first a word needs to be said about the meaning of prices and the use in this chapter of price comparisons. As Richard Landon says, speaking of the antiquarian book trade in Britain, ‘There are two problems with prices: the problem of the real value of the currency at a particular point in time, and the problem of what, exactly, a price

---

41 Wheatley, 112.
42 Lawler, xliii. Unfortunately he gives no source for this price. Since he mentions only the two sales cited in the note above, May 1687 and March 1688, it was presumably for the Folio in one of these. As the Third Folio had appeared recently, it is likely it depressed the First Folio price.
represents.\textsuperscript{43} The first problem I address in the last section of this chapter. Regarding
the second problem, a price, even an average price, by itself has little intrinsic meaning.
It gains meaning through comparison. If one limits the comparisons of First Folio
prices to the prices of books, there are only two kinds of comparison--against First
Folio prices in earlier and later times and against prices of other books. (These are
analogous to two standards of comparison normally used in business: the figures of the
same business in a previous period, or periods (a trend), and the figures of competitors
and/or of other units in the same business. A third standard used in business, the
budget, is not relevant to our purposes here, though the \textit{estimate} in an auction catalogue
is conceptually analogous.) In each time period in this chapter, the two comparisons
will be made. Obviously, for the second kind of comparison, the more similar to the
First Folio the other books are, the more valid the juxtaposition will be. For this reason
I use the prices of folio volumes only, first of the other Shakespeare Folios, then of
other seventeenth-century dramatists. Even these comparisons can only be indicative,
for usually, through lack of information, they cannot take account of such variables as
condition of the volume, its number of leaves, illustrations or quality of binding. When
I go further, comparing the Shakespeare First Folio prices with prices for folios of
other seventeenth-century and earlier literary figures, a trade-off between enriching the
context and decreasing the validity begins to emerge. My belief, and the principle
underlying the analyses which follow, is that, so long as these comparisons are made
with care and one stays alert to the differences among the volumes being compared,
such comparisons have value: that it is interesting to know how Shakespeare Folios
fared in comparison to the folios of Cowley, Chaucer, Milton or Spenser--even though
the literary intent and the scope of their volumes, and the number of leaves, vary greatly
among themselves and from Shakespeare's volume. Such comparisons tell us
something about the current perception of Shakespeare as well as of the First Folio.
More will be said about comparisons in the last section--on trends and current money
values.

Returning to the Skinner and Hampden sale, we can compare the (presumed) First
Folio price of 18/- there to the prices of two other folio collected dramas and to other
literary folios:

- Beaumont and Fletcher's \textit{Works} (nd) 17/6
- Ben Jonson's \textit{Works 'compleat, 2 vol.'} (nd) 11/6

\textsuperscript{43} Richard Landon, 'The Antiquarian Book Trade in Britain 1695-1830: The Use of Auction and
Thus the Folio at 18/- heads the pack, just nosing out Beaumont and Fletcher. At the same time, at either 14/- or 18/- (if these figures are reliable), the Folio stayed close to its publication price of 15/- to 20/- (depending on binding).

Table D permits comparison of these two prices with the prices of the other three Shakespeare Folios. The First Folio prices are from above; the other prices are from Table C in Appendix S/P 2.

| Table D |
|---|---|---|---|
| Prices of the Four Folios 1676-1699 |
| First Folio | Second Folio | Third Folio | Fourth Folio |
| 13 May 1678 | 16/- | 13 May 1678 | £1/8/6 |
| 19 Apr 1680 | 14/- | 2 May 1684 | 15/6 |
| 29 Nov 1680 | 16/- | 19 Apr 1686 | 15/1 |
| 19 Apr 1686 | 15/1 | 4 Oct 1686 | 16/- |
| 9 May 1687 or 12 Mar 1688 | 14/- | 21 Nov 1687 | 17/- |
| 13 Feb 1699 | 18/- | 13 Feb 1688 | 15/6 |
| | | | 15/4 |

Of the eleven prices for the later volumes, only the inexplicably high £1/8/6 of a 1663 Third Folio outdoes the 18/- of the First Folio. It is surprising that the other Third Folio commanded only 15/6, for it had the 1664 imprint and contained, as its title-page blazons, the ‘added seven Playes, never before printed in Folio’; in May 1684 this was the only place to find the additional seven plays, for the Fourth Folio, which retained them, came out only in the following year. These additional plays, presented as by Shakespeare, possibly help to account for the relatively high 18/- which the Fourth Folio fetched in 1686.
The sales of April and October 1686 were exceptional. They were the first two of a four-part series held in Oxford by Cooper and Millington (two of the leading auctioneers of the period) to dispose of stock of the bookseller, Richard Davis. The copy of the catalogues in the British Library is a veritable gold-mine of price information, though one must take into account that such factors as the quantity of books available at the sale, the likelihood that many of the buyers would have been other booksellers and the fact that the sales were in Oxford would have had an effect on prices. All volumes are priced in manuscript, and there are 212 pages in the first catalogue alone. To compare the prices of the Shakespeare Folios, again aware of the limitations of such comparisons, I recorded the prices from the Davis sales of the folio works of Beaumont and Fletcher, Jonson, Killigrew and Davenant; and additionally the prices of Chaucer, Cowley, Donne, Hobbes, Philips, and Sidney, with a Holinshed included for its association. These are shown in Table E in Appendix S/P 3, at the end of which I have also included the prices of the First Folio's press-room companions, Brooke (4/2) and Fayvin (7/0). As noted in Table D, prices of the later Shakespeare Folios in the same sales are as follows: Second 15/1, and Fourth 16/- and 18/-. The Fourth's 18/- is the highest in the sample, just exceeding Beaumont and Fletcher at 17/8, with Davenant the third highest author at 16/6. The correlation of the higher prices with dramatic works is noteworthy. The average of the three Beaumont and Fletcher prices is higher at 16/10 than the average of the three Shakespeare prices at 16/1. Cowley's Works, the best-seller with eleven lots, is somewhat behind the Folio prices—with the top three prices of 14/3, 13/6 and 12/8. For comparing, it should be noted that, while the three later Shakespeare Folios were in the same sales, the 14/- for a First Folio occurred a year or two later, and the 18/- thirteen years later. Comparisons of this sort have only a limited validity, where there are such variables as those mentioned above and where the data are only from one set of sales. They are enough to suggest, however, that while Shakespeare was holding his own, he was not commanding prices out of the ordinary. This seems to be consistent with contemporary critical opinion. As Gary Taylor says, 'During much of the seventeenth century Shakespeare's plays seemed to most critics inferior to those of John Fletcher—and to

---

44 The fact that these sales were of a bookseller's stock may account for two Fourth Folios being disposed of so soon after publication; they may even have been new copies. Richard Davis, who wrote prefaces to the catalogues, was, according to Lawler, the 'largest bookseller and publisher' in England, and apparently needed to reduce his stock. The first of these sales was not only the first book auction to be held in Oxford but, again according to Lawler, contained the largest collection of books offered for sale by auction in the seventeenth century—10,168 lots, which Lawler translates into 30,000 volumes. Even then, it represented only 'a third part' of Davis's stock (Lawler, 30-33). The dates of the four sales were: 19 April and 4 October 1686, 25 June 1688 and 11 April 1692. Lawler seems unaware of the fourth sale (30), and, of the three Shakespeare Folios in the auctions, he noted only the Fourth, sold on 19 April (35).

45 All the volumes referred to in this paragraph are folios, so that the factor of size is not differential, though the number of leaves in a volume may have affected price. Commenting on what moved buyers, Lawler remarks: 'The first folio Shakespeare produced 14s. because it was a folio volume; as much did Jonson's and Davenant's folios reach; and most of the prices were regulated by sizes' (xliii).
A CATALOGUE

OF A LARGE and CURIOUS COLLECTION of BOOKS,

Including the Elegant LIBRARY of

GEORGE ANDREWS, Esq;

of WELLS, Deceased;

And that of a very Eminent PHYSICIAN,

With several other COLLECTIONS;

Amongst which are the following, viz.

FOLIO.
Blomefield's Norfolk, 5 v.
Tanner's Notitia Maritima.
Chauncy's Hertfordshire.
King's Vale Royal of Cheshire.
Horley's Britannia Romania.
Sir W. Dugdale's Works, 10 vol.
Purchas's Pilgrimes, 5 v.
Le Brun's Travels, 3 v.
Churchill's Collect. Voyages, 8 v.
Harris's Voyages, 2 vol.
Linsehoven's Voyages.
Voyages par Thévenot, 4 t.
Voyages par Le Brun, 3 t. gr. 8vo.
Brown's Nat. Hist. of Jamaica.
Spence's Polymetics.

FOLIO.
Pindar, cba. max. corio turc. Oxon.
Srabonis Geog. 2 t. cb. max. Angl.
Cartari's Comment. a Clarke, corio turc.
Polybius, Calaboni.
Ptolemei Geog. 2 Bertia
Aristophanes, Gr. corio turc. Ad.
Ang. Politiani Opera Ad.
Aristotelis Opera, a Du Val, 2 t. fol. deaur.
Mathemat. Veteres, corio turc.
Sandrart Academ. Ars Pict. corio turc.
Rogers's Prints, 2 vol.
Lord Burlington's Palladio.
Roof's Statuas, left impressions.
Hamilton on Vulcanos, 2 v. coloured
Stuart's Athens.
Wood's Balbec and Palmyra.
Les Tables d'Alexandrie, par Le Brun.
Atlas par Robert
— par De Lille
— Nouveau

Par. 1762
New General Atlas, from Danville, &c.
Heads and Lives of Illustrious Men, 1 paper.
Antiqu. de Rome, par Delgodetz, en maroq.
Pierres Grav. par Picart, en maroq.
Willughby's Birds, with MS Notes of Dr. Darwin.

Hippocrates & Galen, 13 tom. corio ruff.
Hoffmanni Opera, 6 tom.
Hayes on Birds, coloured.
Edwards's Plants, coloured.
Hill on Plants, l. p. coloured.
— on Fullili, l. p. coloured.
Albini Anat. co. max. corio ruff.
Cooper's Anatomy, bound in morocco Oxon.
Hortus Romanus, 4 tom.

And many others equally good, which will be sold, for Ready Money only, this Day, July 1781, and continue on Sale till all are sold,

By THOMAS PAYNE and SONS,
BOOKSELLERS,
Next the Mews Gate, in Castle Street, St. Martin's.
Catalogues to be had, with Prices printed (Price 6d) at Mr. Sewell's, Bookseller, Cornhill; Mr. Owen's, Bookseller, near Temple-Bar, Fleet Street; Mr. Lewis, Bookseller, Ravel Street, Covent Garden; Mr. Watts, Bookseller, at Charing Cross; Mr. Ridley, Bookseller, St. Thomas Street, Russow, Bookseller, New Bond.

those of Ben Jonson too'. In any case, no one by this point—at least in print—had recognised the textual primacy of the First Folio over its successors, and demand for Shakespeare's collected plays would have been satisfied by the apparently better, and (in the case of the 1664 issue of the Third Folio and the Fourth Folio) apparently more complete, later editions.

D 1700-1799: SALES AND PRICES

During the eighteenth century, changes in the Shakespeare world and developments in the book world were momentous. An overview of these changes is useful for understanding the history of the sales and prices of the First Folio. Shakespeare was restored to the stage in 1660 and continued to be played as Colley Cibber (d 1757, actor from 1690, playwright and manager of the Theatre Royal) replaced Thomas Betterton (d 1710) as Shakespeare's theatrical standard-bearer. For the eighty-five years up to Nicholas Rowe's edition (1709), which he based on the Fourth Folio, four editions had satisfied demand. From Rowe onwards the plays became the focus of editorial and scholarly attention and rivalry; in the hundred years after Rowe there were sixty-five editions. Rowe's publisher was Jacob Tonson (d 1736), 'the founder of literary publishing in English'. Tonson with his family successors, owning the copyrights, held a monopoly on Shakespeare publication; as a consequence, the Tonson family were central to his promotion up to 1772. 'The Tonsons decided who would edit Shakespeare': it was they who chose, in sequence, Rowe, Pope, Theobald, Warburton, Johnson and Capell. Pope's Dunciad raised Shakespeare rivalry to mock epic proportions.

Defining when Shakespeare 'made it to the top', Taylor comments,

Everyone agrees that, after a slow but steady upward climb, Shakespeare's coronation as the King of English Poets finally occurred in the middle of the eighteenth century, at some time between the death of Alexander Pope (1744) and the birth of William Wordsworth (1770). (114)

From Rowe's time onward, one of the remarkable aspects of the interest in Shakespeare was how deep and widespread it was; for example, Arthur Sherbo documents at length 'how many different men, and women, furnished aid to various editors of

---

46 Taylor, Reinventing Shakespeare, 28.
49 With the Tonsons' 1714 duodecimo reprint of Rowe, 'Shakespeare first gained a wide reading public' (Bate, Shakespearean Constitutions, 23). This public helped create the cultural ambience within which Folio sales took place.
50 Taylor, 70.
Shakespeare'. As Brian Vickers puts it, referring to the third quarter of the century, 'Suggesting emendations was almost a national pastime'.

The manifestations of Shakespeare's apotheosis were far-reaching. In 1736 a Shakespeare's Ladies Club was formed 'with the specific aim of persuading the theatre managers to put on more Shakespeare'. In the period 1733-52, the performance of his plays reached a frequency 'that has never been equalled'. His monument was erected in Westminster Abbey in 1741. The Professor of Poetry at Oxford gave the first academic lectures on Shakespeare in an English university in 1751-56 (114). From 1747 to 1776 David Garrick ran Drury Lane in rivalry with Covent Garden (115)—both theatres prospering from their Shakespeare productions (in 1750 with competing performances of Romeo and Juliet—117). In 1765 Dr Johnson's much-anticipated and widely heralded edition was published (and within some three months Steevens was advertising his intention to undertake another edition). In 1769 Garrick achieved his 'marketing masterpiece', a 'Shakespeare Jubilee' at Stratford-upon-Avon: 'reported in newspapers throughout Europe, the Jubilee spawned Stratford's literary tourism industry' (119). In 1774 the first Shakespeare public lecture (on 1 Henry IV) was given. In 1776 the first complete translation of Shakespeare into French came out (123); in 1784 the first single-volume edition in the eighteenth century appeared; and in 1795-96 the first edition printed in America was published. In 1789 John Boydell opened the Shakespeare Gallery in Pall Mall; 'the conception of a gallery of works by major artists devoted specifically to Shakespearean illustration and divorced from theatrical performance was completely new'. In 1795 William Henry Ireland (whose father owned a First Folio) published some supposedly Shakespearean manuscripts; such was the interest that Malone's reply demonstrating they were forgeries sold 500 copies in two days. From 1793 to 1800, 'there were some fifteen editions of Shakespeare'. The century's scholarship culminated in the great editions of Malone (1790), Steevens (1793) and Reed (1803).

Shakespeare's 'cultural presence' (to borrow Bate's phrase again) in the latter part of the century can be summarised from two angles. First, the literary: as Vickers puts

---

51 Sherbo, ix. For the generality, see pp ix-xii and pp 187-88. For the particulars, see the many names Sherbo cites in connection with each edition.
53 Bate, 25.
54 Vickers, III (1975), xi.
55 Taylor, 96. The page references in the remainder of this paragraph are also to Taylor.
56 Sherbo, 27.
58 'At the time this monumentally important edition was produced, the common publishing practice in America was to import sheets from London or Dublin'—Heritage Book Shop, Inc, Catalogue 197, William Shakespeare Collected Editions 1623-1823 (Los Angeles, [1995]), 23.
59 Bate, 46—my emphasis, added to stress the point that Shakespeareana were beginning to take on a life of their own with no connection to the theatre.
60 Schoenbaum, 1993, 161.
61 Sherbo, 155.
it, 'dozens of books of criticism or literary history have substantial discussions of his work, and incidental references abound in books, magazines, newspapers, lectures, novels, letters, theatre reviews, and poetry' and he goes on to say, 'His prestige is now so great that he is seen not only as England's greatest writer but as the world's greatest'.

Then the commercial: speaking of the Jubilee, the Shakespeare Gallery and the Ireland forgeries, Bate makes the point that they 'offer prime examples of the process whereby in the latter part of the eighteenth century Shakespeare became commercialised and was made into a commodity of material consumption' (45). It takes no conceptual leap to embrace the First Folio in that observation.

A turning point in the history of the First Folio occurred at about the middle of the century with the recognition of its textual primacy. Dr Johnson was the first to publish this conclusion (1765): 'The truth is, that the first is equivalent to all others, and that the rest only deviate from it by the printer's negligence. . . . I collated them all at the beginning, but afterwards used only the first'. Capell criticised Rowe and his successors for their choice of copy-text: 'The superstructure cannot be a sound one, which is built upon so bad a foundation as that work of Mr. Rowe's; which all of them, as we see, in succession, have yet made their corner-stone'. He was at pains to tell his readers that 'so long ago as the year 1745' he had 'thought seriously of a cure [for] the wretched condition [that] his Author was reduc'd to by these late tamperings' (19), and concluded that 'the first folio . . . text . . . is by far the most faultless of the editions in that form'. By the turn of the century, John Horne Tooke, a politician and close reader and annotator of Shakespeare, could confidently write (1805): 'The first Folio in my opinion, is the only edition worth regarding. . . . For, by the presumptuous licence of the dwarfish commentators, who are forever cutting him down to their own size, we risk the loss of Shakespear's genuine text; which that Folio assuredly contains.'

The eighteenth-century book trade was marked by high activity, fast growth, change in taste and serious collecting. Munby and Coral record over 2,400 book catalogues, one third of them in the last two decades. Retail sales escalated: Sherbo speaks of there being 150 booksellers in London between 1726 and 1775. The change in book-buyers' taste is reflected in the organisation of auction catalogues—from an organising principle of 'Latin and theological works first' to one of 'English works first and no distinction between theological and secular works'; at the same time the dominating proportion of books shifted from theological to secular, with the latter

---

63 By 'primacy', I mean over the later Folios, which have no independent textual authority whatever, not over some of the Quartos, as Capell already recognised.
64 The Plays of William Shakespeare, ed Samuel Johnson, 8 vols (1765) i, D1".
65 Mr William Shakespeare his Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies, ed Edward Capell, 10 vols (1768), i, 19. As mentioned above, Rowe used the Fourth Folio.
66 Ibid, i, 21. Having stated his preference for the Quartos where they exist, he says in all the rest (as well as in 2 Henry IV, Othello, and Richard III) he followed the First Folio.
67 Quoted in Lee, 1924, 87-88, from Tooke’s Diversions of Parley.
ultimately dwarfing the former. Libraries—both private and public—were formed with increasing fervour. There were close links between collecting and scholarship, evidenced in the Shakespeare world, for example, by the collections of Elijah Fenton (who helped Pope\(^6\)), Martin Folkes (who helped Theobald\(^6\)), Edward Capell (who bequeathed his library to Trinity College, Cambridge, reckoned by Seymour De Ricci 'as one of the best Shakespearean collections in the United Kingdom\(^7\)\(^1\)), Dr Johnson (whose library was sold in 1785), Richard Warner (who contributed to the 1773 Johnson-Steevens edition\(^7\)\(^2\)), Richard Farmer (who wrote *An Essay on the Learning of Shakespeare*\(^7\)\(^3\)), George Steevens (the sale of whose library in 1800 was the earliest auction of a large Shakespearean collection\(^7\)\(^4\)), Edmond Malone (a serious collector of Shakespeareana, whose collection went to the Bodleian\(^7\)\(^5\)), and Isaac Reed (whose extensive library was sold in 1807). Among the wealthy, book-collecting by the end of the century developed into a 'passion'.\(^7\)\(^6\) The passion extended to First Folios, as evidenced by the rapid rise in the rate of sales in the 1780s and 1790s and in prices paid in the 1790s (as we shall see below).

The relationship between editing and owning a First Folio was even closer than is suggested in the previous paragraph. The fact is, after Rowe, all the great eighteenth-century editors except Warburton bought their own copy and worked with it as part of their library. Copies were not only available, they were affordable—even by inhabitants of Grub Street like Johnson. One copy was owned successively by Theobald and Steevens; it is now in the John Rylands University of Manchester Library. Another was owned successively by Theobald, Johnson and Steevens; it is now in the British Library. Dr Johnson possibly owned another copy.\(^7\)\(^7\) Hanmer owned a copy, now in the Folger. Capell owned a copy, now at Trinity College, Cambridge. Malone owned a copy, now at the Bodleian. From a comment of George Steevens's, it would seem that Pope owned, as well as used, a First Folio. In a letter to Isaac Reed, dated Hampstead Heath, 5 October 1790, Steevens writes of the contemporary industry in making up incomplete copies and continues: 'I never knew till yesterday that among others, [Henderson] fitted up one for Pope'.\(^7\)\(^8\)

---

\(^{6}\) Ibid, xi, 2 and 3.

\(^{7}\) Ibid, 8. See Appendix S/P 5 for the sale of Folkes's library in 1756.


\(^{7}\)\(^2\) Sherbo, 46-48.

\(^{7}\)\(^3\) See Appendix S/P 5 for the sale of Farmer's library in 1798. He accumulates twenty-nine references in Sherbo's *The Birth of Shakespeare Studies*.

\(^{7}\)\(^4\) De Ricci, *English Collectors*, 62.

\(^{7}\)\(^5\) Ibid, 63.

\(^{7}\)\(^6\) Lee 1924, 97.

\(^{7}\)\(^7\) Ibid, 92, but see the footnote to Dr Johnson's sale in Appendix S/P 5, 1785, regarding the anomalies concerning Johnson's ownership of Folios.

\(^{7}\)\(^8\) The letter is in a bound volume, 'George Steevens letters to I. Reed 1777-1800' (label on spine), 'From the Shakespearean Library of Marsden J. Perry' (label on doublure), in the Folger Shakespeare
This making up of incomplete copies is concrete evidence of rising value and demand. In another context Steevens described the 'fitting up copies of this book for sale':

When leaves have been wanting, they have been reprinted with battered types, and foisted into the vacancies, without notice of such defects and remedies applied to them.
When the title has been lost, a spurious one has been fabricated, with a blank space left for the head of Shakespeare, afterwards added from the second, third, or fourth impression.
Since it was thought advantageous to adopt such contrivances while the book was only valued at six or seven guineas, now it has reached its present enormous price, may not artifice be still more on the stretch to vamp up copies for the benefit of future catalogues and auctions? (Plays, 1793, i, 445, n 6)

The painstaking care with which Folios were refurbished is illustrated by the detailed bills of Roger Payne (1739-97) accompanying the books upon which he had worked. His bill for the volume which is now Folger 11 is preserved at the Folger. Payne speaks for example of:

Six leaves Inlay'd in so exceeding neat Manner as not to be seen without being told of it . . . The Title with above 40 pieces to strengthen [it] . . . The Whole Book mended in a great many places and the Whole Book Carefully looked over to clean the dirt away took me 7 full days and 1/2 . . . Finished in the Taste I thought suitable to the Book . . . The Greatest care hath been taken of margins. The Binding in the very best manner [£]3.8.

The £3/8/- was in addition to £1/5/9 to cover the seven and a half days for mending and cleaning. The substantial refurbishment cost--£4/13/9--reflects the perceived value of the volume.

Table G in Appendix S/P 5 records the details of eighteenth-century First Folio sales. (My research coverage and methods are described in Appendix S/P 4.) Table H in Appendix S/P 6 gives summary data on sales of the Second, Third and Fourth Folios. In the eighteenth century booksellers' retail sales catalogues became an important feature of the market place and increasingly from 1732 these usefully give printed prices as well as the date the books were first offered for sale. Accordingly, for the eighteenth century (only) I include offer prices as well as sales prices to increase the amount of data for analysis, especially for the Second, Third and Fourth Folios. It is true that an asking price in a bookseller's catalogue does not represent market value as reliably as a price actually paid, such as one recorded at an auction. One could argue

Library (Call-mark: MS C.b.2). It is in Steevens's hand. Peter Blayney kindly alerted me to its existence. 'A Finding List of Books Surviving from Pope's Library', containing 176 titles, in Maynard Mack, Collected in Himself: Essays Critical, Biographical, and Bibliographical on Pope (Newark, NJ, 1982), 394-460, does not contain a Shakespeare Folio.

79 Quoted from the transcription of the bill in Christie's Catalogue, 16 July 1912 (one lot only), where the bill is reproduced. The transcript in the penultimate line has 'marging', which I changed to 'margins' having consulted a photocopy of Payne's original manuscript. In the photocopy the '40 pieces' in line 2 is not clear and I could not confirm 'manner' in the last line. The strengthening seems to apply to the 'Six leaves' as well as to 'The Title'.
that a bookseller's asking price is what an informed seller believed would attract a buyer and therefore should be close to market value, but inevitably booksellers reduced their offer price at times if a book did not move, as vividly illustrated in Table F in Appendix S/P 4. In fact, the use of offer prices does not affect conclusions concerning the First Folio materially because, of the twenty-two prices noted in Table G, only five appear to be offers (numbers 4, 5, 13, 22 and 23) and most of these are irrelevant for analytical purposes because they are for defective copies. In any case, even if one wished to be purist and use only sales prices, one would be thwarted, because, as Munby and Coral say in their Introduction (xviii), auction catalogues and bookseller's retail sales U
catalogues are 'virtually indistinguishable' in much of this period, as I experienced when I attempted to italicise data from booksellers' catalogues in Table H. (To avoid the cumbersome 'sales and offers', 'sales' includes 'offers' in this section.)

Sales of the First Folio took off slowly. I found only three in the first four decades. However, I found eleven in the next four decades, and fourteen in the last two decades, a total of twenty-eight. Table I below, derived from Appendixes S/P 5 and 6, shows these sales by decade in the context both of the sales of the other three Folios and of the publication of Shakespeare editions. The editions cited are the key ones treated by Arthur Sherbo in The Birth of Shakespeare Studies. For the century as a whole there were fewer sales of the First Folio than of the Second and Fourth, and far more than of the Third (evidencing the greater rarity of the Third). Of all Folio sales in Table I, two-thirds occurred in the last four decades, closely reflecting Shakespeare's arrival 'at the top' some time between 1744 and 1770.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1700s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rowe1709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rowe 1714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pope 1723-25 &amp;1728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Theobald 1733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hanmer 1743-44 Warburton 1747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Johnson 1765 Capell 1767-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Johnson 1765 Capell 1767-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Johnson-Steevens 1773 &amp; 1778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780s</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Johnson-Steevens 1785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790s</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Malone 1790 Steevens 1793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I

Number of Sales of the Four Folios
by Decade in the 1700s
with Dates of Shakespeare Editions
A half-century comparison of sales rates shows that four times as many First Folios changed hands in the second half as in the first half. This rate compares with those of the other three Folios as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Sales of the Four Folios, First and Second Half of the 1700s</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First half-century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second half-century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of 2nd vs 1st 1/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Appendix S/P 5 reveals, the vendors or former owners of these First Folios included Lewis Theobald, Dr Johnson, George Steevens, David Garrick, Richard Farmer (Canon, Master of Emmanuel College, Librarian to the University of Cambridge and Fellow of the Royal Society), a President of the Royal Society, five doctors (one an MP, another an FRS, a third a Fellow of the Royal Society of Physicians), and an FSA—ie, mostly professional and distinguished men. The Folios of the foregoing all changed hands. There were others belonging to the landed and wealthy, which in this century did not change hands. As Steevens said in 1793, 'Most of the first folios now extant, are known to have belonged to ancient families resident in the country'. Among those whose sale did not contain a First Folio were Thomas Betterton, Elihu Yale, James Thomson, Henry Fielding, Laurence Sterne, Thomas Gray, Thomas Day, Oliver Goldsmith, Sir Thomas Browne, Jonathan Swift, and Nicholas Rowe (whose sale contained a Second Folio).

Table K in Appendix S/P 7 presents prices for all four Folios by decade. For the first half-century no firm conclusion can be made. There is little data and what there is is insubstantial: the £1/6/- c. 1700—see Appendix S/P 5—loses credibility with Lee’s ‘probably’ and his failure to give a source; the 15/- and 8/- in 1740 were the bookseller Jackson’s asking prices (we don’t know his proclivity for bargaining); and the 8/- was for an ‘imperfect’, and therefore not comparable, copy. The only generalisation on prices possible in the first half-century is that Fourth Folios in the 1730s were offered at

---

80 *Plays*, 1793, i, 445, n 6.
81 Munby, i, ii, v, and vii.
83 There is no mention of a Shakespeare Folio in William LeFanu, ed, *A Catalogue of Books Belonging to Dr Jonathan Swift, Dean of St Patrick’s, Dublin, Aug. 19, 1715* (Cambridge Bibliographical Society Monograph 10, 1988), nor in the sale catalogue of Swift’s library in Harold Williams, *Dean Swift’s Library With a Facsimile of the Original Sale Catalogue* (Cambridge, 1932), though Williams covers the possibility of Swift’s owning a Folio (with no mention of ‘First’) on pp 74-75.
about £1/5/- to £1/7/6. At this time the Fourth was generally regarded as the 'Best edition', still being promoted as such in the 1740s. This, and the absence of a title-page on the First Folio offered at about the same time for 15/-, could explain the Fourth Folio's premium.

In the second half-century only one First Folio, other than imperfect copies, went for less than three guineas. In the 1760s, the average price for four copies was £5/8/-. Concurrently, the new eight-volume Johnson edition, 1765, retailed bound for £2/8/- and the ten-volume Capell edition, 1768, for £2/2/-. In the 1770s, the only comparable Folio price was £5/5/- This is precisely what Beloe stated was 'the standard value of "a fine copy"' about 1770; he 'refused "at nine guineas a superb copy"'. In the 1780s, the only comparable price was £10. In the 1790s, the average price for seven copies (excluding two imperfect copies) was £30/2/6. The £35/14/- in the sale of 1 March 1790 was an exception caused by the enthusiasm and permitted by the wealth of the buyer, the Duke of Roxburghe (though it was an unusually fine copy). The only explanation of the even more exceptional price of seventy guineas paid c. 1792 by 'Jennings, a well-known collector', is the salesmanship of Thomas Payne and the fact that this is a 'perfect' copy (in Lee's Class IA and later in the Huth collection). Steevens spoke with heavy irony in his letter to Isaac Reed, cited above, when he wrote in October 1790:

[Edwards, the bookseller] thinks he shall do me a favour by letting me have it at the small charge of twenty guineas... and as soon as I have been cheated in my bargain (As I certainly shall be) I must think myself at liberty to cheat some one else...

Less than three years later, he wrote in the Johnson/Steevens edition cited above that prices were 'very lately repeatedly £25' (449) for what is now 'the most expensive book in our language' (447). Perhaps 'repeatedly £25' is an exaggeration as there are only three prices above £21, though £25 is less than the average in the 1790s if one excludes the two poor copies.

It is the 1780s that mark a shift in the market's perception of the First Folio. For example, it was customary for booksellers to highlight, on the cover of their catalogues, titles which they believed would attract the interest of buyers. The first time I have seen the First Folio achieve this distinction is on the catalogue of Thomas Payne, dated July 1781. To name a precise moment for the 'take-off' of the value of the Folio, from the data in Table K, it would be 2 May 1787 when Richard Wright's copy fetched £10.

84 Monthly Review, 33 (1765), 285, and 39 (1768), 271. Comparable prices for subsequent new editions, all from Monthly Review, were as follows: Johnson-Steevens, 1773, £3/- (49 (1773), 419); Johnson-Steevens, 1778, £3/10/- (62 (1780), 12); Johnson-Steevens, 1785, £3/10/- (75 (1786), 81), and Malone, 1790, £3/17/- (n.s. 12 (1793), 56). Each of these editions was in ten volumes.

85 Lee, Census, Introduction, 8.

86 The story of this sale is frequently told. See, e.g., Lee, Census Introduction, 9, and Otteness, 106.

87 Lee, Census, Copy 9. I found no reference to this extraordinary price in the issues of the Gentleman's Magazine for 1792.
This is the starting-point for the rises of the 1790s, which persisted in the following century. By the same token, as shown in column 2 of Table I above, this is precisely when the rate of sales began to accelerate. Events following the French Revolution must have affected sales and prices. For the art market, Gerald Reitlinger speaks of 'wartime speculation' in the 1790s.

It seems that prices of the other three Folios did not match the rise of the First. In the second half-century, only two Seconds exceeded three guineas, only one Third exceeded two guineas, and no Fourth achieved £2. In fact, the average price of the Fourth was lower in the second half-century presumably reflecting the changed perception of its textual value. Table L in Appendix S/P 7 shows four First Folios in the same catalogues as the other three Folios. It clearly demonstrates the premium the First Folio already commanded over its successors from at least 1765. There is no evidence yet, at least in these catalogues, of any demand for the four Folios together as a package. In the 14 March 1765 sale, for example, the First, Second and Fourth Folios were purchased by different buyers, with no buyer recorded for the Third.

It remains to compare the prices of the First Folio in the eighteenth century with prices of the folios of other writers, in particular other dramatists. A strong cautionary word must again be entered about conclusions drawn from one-to-one comparisons, since so many factors—information on which is largely unknown—affect price. Oddly, the factor normally having the greatest influence—the condition of the volume—would seem to have been usually against the Shakespeare volume. Steevens makes the point that 'Of all volumes, those of popular entertainment are soonest injured', and goes on to say that it 'would be difficult to name four folios that are oftener found in dirty and mutilated condition, than this first assemblage of Shakespeare's plays'. Despite condition, the First Folio commanded premium prices. This was true not only in the last two or three decades. If one looks at the prices of literary folio works in random years from 1732 to 1770 (that is, the period embracing a span of years when the Folio's textual primacy was not recognised and then was recognised), few approach even the lowest contemporary price of a First Folio. I took a random sample of twenty-eight prices for seven selected writers in this period. See Table M in Appendix S/P 8. Among the folios of dramatists, the highest Beaumont and Fletcher price was £1/1/-, the highest Jonson 18/-, the highest Dryden £1/5/- and a Davenant went for 7/-. Among the folio works of Cowley, Chaucer and Spenser, only Chaucer's Works (1721) exceeded £1. On the other hand, to avoid being carried away by the Folio's price performance, it is salutary to note that a Gutenberg Bible sold for £100 in 1793. (For Gutenberg prices, see Chart 5 following the appendixes to this chapter.)

For the century as a whole, the rate of sale and the price level of the First Folio closely parallel the growth in Shakespeare's reputation. The Folio got off to a slow

---

89 Plays, 1793, 1, 446, n 6.
start, both in number of sales and in price. By mid-century, increased demand by
collectors and scholars began to be reflected in both sales and price. By the last decade,
the Folio had taken off by both measures. At an average price of over £30, it left far
behind both its successor Folios and the folios of other well-known authors.

**E 1800-1899: SALES AND PRICES**

A view of the Shakespeare world and the book world in the nineteenth century will
again form a backdrop to the sales and price history of the First Folio. The eighteenth-
century editing tradition extended through the 1803 Reed and the 1821 Boswell-
Malonevariorum editions, with 1500 and 1800 pages respectively of introductory
matter. These contrasted with Bowdler's expurgated *Family Shakespeare* (four
editions from 1818) and Charles Knight’s pictorial editions (the first 1838-43). Other
major editions appeared at almost the same rate as in the eighteenth century, including
John Payne Collier's editions (from 1841 to 1878), James O Halliwell’s editions
(1850-1887) and Alexander Dyce's editions (from 1857 to 1895-1901); a major
American edition was published in 1857-66, the authoritative *Cambridge Shakespeare*
in 1863-66 and 1891-93, the long-lasting Globe edition in 1864, the W J Craig edition
in 1891 and the single plays in the Oxford Clarendon edition from 1869 to 1906. In the
1850s alone 162 Shakespeare editions appeared.91

In the first decades of the century Shakespeare received new critical attention—from
Coleridge, Lamb, and Hazlitt.92 In 1840, four Shakespeareans, John Payne Collier,
Alexander Dyce, Charles Knight, and James O Halliwell (later Halliwell-Phillipps),
under Collier’s lead, founded the Shakespeare Society, which for a decade published
books advancing learning on Shakespeare and related subjects. In 1841, Thomas
Carlyle crowned him: ‘This King Shakespeare, does he not shine, in crowned
sovereignty, over us all?’94 His reputation spread internationally, as exemplified
notably in Germany by ‘unser Shakespeare’ and Nikolaus Delius’s *Werke* (1854-61).
In the last decades, under Furnivall’s influence and the auspices of the New Shakspere
Society (1874), a pseudo-scientific approach was applied to Shakespeare studies, with
Fleay’s metrical tests for example, contrasting on the one hand with the flush of the

---

90 F E Halliday, *The Cult of Shakespeare* (1957), 124-25. The dates of editions which follow are from
92 In his chapter, ‘Quotation’, in *Shakespearean Constitutions*, Jonathan Bate illustrates Shakespeare’s
depth of penetration into Hazlitt’s mind: ‘There are about two and a half thousand quotations from the
plays in Howe’s edition of the *Complete Works*. Hazlitt quotes from a wide range of authors; the
second highest frequency belongs to Milton, but the total number of Miltonic phrases is outweighed by
those, over five hundred, from *Hamlet* alone’ (188). As he says, it was ‘common during this period to
quote from Shakespeare in conversation and informal writings’, noting that Keats’s and Byron’s letters
are ‘packed with Shakespearean quotations’ (195, n). And further afield: ‘If Freud was one of the
nineteenth century’s obsessive readers and quoters of Shakespeare, Marx was another’ (201).
93 Schoenbaum, 1993, 251.
94 Quoted by Lee, from *Heroes and Hero-Worship*, ‘The Hero as Poet’, as the aphorism for his *Life of
Shakespeare*—preceding the Preface in both 1925 and 1931.
Baconian controversy, and on the other with P A Daniel's pioneering bibliographical studies. As for stage performance, Shakespeare was as popular as ever. Even during what George Odell calls 'spare times for Shakespeare' (1817-37)—due in large part in his view to the absence of theatrical leadership—the plays were frequently acted. For the century as a whole, Shakespeare's position in people's minds is suggested by the fact that the reputations of the great nineteenth-century Shakespearean actors and actresses still—one or two hundred years later—retain their lustre. Kemble, Mrs Siddons, Edmund Kean, Macready, Charles Kean, Henry Irving, Ellen Terry—these live almost as household names.

Picking up again the theme of the relationship between editing and owning a First Folio, we see that the tradition of the previous century carries on well into the nineteenth century. One copy was successively owned by Isaac Reed and James Boswell, the younger; it is now in the Sir John Soane Museum. 'Early possession of an imperfect Shakespeare Folio left an indelible impression' on Charles Knight; he 'studied the First Folio with exceptional zeal'. Halliwell-Phillipps at one time or other owned one of the copies now at Stratford-upon-Avon, the copy now at the University of Glasgow, one of the copies now in the New York Public Library, one of the Folger copies, and the Watson copy which has disappeared. Dyce owned a Folio and bequeathed it with his important Shakespeare collection to the Victoria and Albert Museum. Horace Howard Furness, independently wealthy, purchased a First Folio in 1871, having failed to procure the Shakespeare portion of the Barton library. This volume became part of his extensive Shakespeare library, now at the University of Pennsylvania, which he put together expressly for editing the *New Variorum Edition*. These editors, like their eighteenth-century counterparts, all used their Folio as part of their working library. With Furness, however, the tradition ceased. I have found no later editor who owned a First Folio. After the Daniel sale of 1864, as we shall see below, the price became prohibitive—at least for most scholars. At the same time, the availability of facsimile editions, encouraged by the high prices for originals, helped to

---

95 George C D Odell, *Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving*, 2 vols (1921), II, 124.
96 The enthusiasm for chasing and the delight in capturing a First Folio is illustrated in the letter of John Britton (April 1825), who purchased this volume at auction for Sloane. The transcription of his letter, stored with the volume, is appropriately introduced by a graphic verbal picture of Britton, late for the auction, 'galloping through the streets of London and reaching 'the Sale Room at the very instant the Lot alluded to was put on the Table'. Britton then wrote to Sloane in the extravagant language of field sport and game food:

By extraordinary good luck, I just arrived at the death — the game was started when I entered the field, — tho' hot in the pursuit I was cool and collected at each leap, and not only was the first in, when caught, but immediately bay'd the prize. — It is now sent for your larder, where it will long keep, be always in good flavour, and do honor to the possessor. — It will afford a perpetually standing dish on the table and Talent — and never create surfeit, but "increase of appetite" . . .

98 Lee, 1906, 26
satisfy scholars’ demands. W Carew Hazlitt, eschewing the customary tone of reverence for the original Folio, said in the 1860s: ‘Space would be wasted in describing a book which, through facsimiles, has become so accessible to all who care about such matters.’

Halliwell-Phillipps, by himself, had considerable influence on the fortunes of the First Folio. According to De Ricci, the real revival in collecting early editions of Shakespeare ‘was due to the unflagging industry of [this] laborious Shakespearean scholar’. He not only owned the five copies referred to above, but, according to Lee in the Census Introduction, ‘seems to have bought and sold some dozen different copies’ (12). His industry is further illustrated by his vandalistic removal of the early proof of the portrait from the Stratford copy. Finally, he wrote the preface to the 1876 First Folio facsimile edition.

Some of the major changes in the book world, such as growth in literacy, the mechanisation of book production, the transformation in publishing and book distribution, and the ongoing dispute over new-book pricing ending in the net book agreement had only an indirect influence on the fortunes of the First Folio. Others, like the expanding enthusiasm for book-collecting, the shift in taste towards literary criteria in book-collecting, the growth in the number of book sales, the increasing importance of the bookseller, the beginning of Shakespeareana collecting in America, the appearance of two American First Folio censuses, the sale of great libraries, especially Shakespeare libraries, and the rise in the prices of collectable books, were intimately connected with the Folio. Underpinning and fostering these developments were the writings of the bibliographers, such as Thomas Frognall Dibdin (d 1847) in the first four decades (eg, Library Companion, 1824), William Thomas Lowndes (d 1843) especially in the thirties, (eg, The Bibliographer’s Manual of English Literature, 1834), Henry George Bohn (d 1884) in the forties to sixties (eg, A Bibliographical Account of the Works of William Shakespeare, including every known edition, translation and commentary, 1864), and W Carew Hazlitt (d 1913) in the last four decades (eg, his series of Bibliographical Collections and Notes, 1876-89). A benign influence on the rare book world was the Roxburghe Club, formed after the Roxburgh sale in 1812 (covered below), with twenty-four members and with Dibdin as its first Secretary. Each member was, and is, expected to present and fund a limited edition of a volume of some rarity.

100 W Carew Hazlitt, Handbook to the Popular, Poetical and Dramatic Literature of Great Britain (1867), 547.
101 De Ricci, English Collectors, 144.
102 The leaf was bought by the collector Marsden J Perry of Providence, RI (Lee, Census, copy 107) and is now in the Folger (M H Spielmann, The Title-Page of the First Folio of Shakespeare's Plays (1924), 39.
104 Winsor, 87-90 and Fleming, 101-17.
One measure of activity in the book trade is the number of book auctions: the British Library *List of Catalogues of English Book Sales*\(^{105}\) cites nearly 6,000 catalogues in the nineteenth century, with an average of fifty-two sales per year in the first half-century and sixty-five per year in the second half, the annual average peaking in the fifties and sixties. The role of certain booksellers was central to the First Folio’s market history. Lee covers this topic in the Introduction to his *Census*. In the nineteenth century,

probably the dealer who handled the greatest number of copies was Joseph Lilly, who was in business in the neighbourhood of Covent Garden for nearly forty years (1831-70). His catalogues occasionally indicate that he had as many as six copies on his shelves at one time, and it is estimated that his transactions covered in all some hundred copies. Five figured in the auction in 1871 which disposed of his stock on his death.\(^{106}\) . . . Lilly’s successor, as the leading dealer in the First Folio, was Bernard Quaritch, who was in business in London between 1847 and 1899. As many as fifty copies probably passed through Quaritch’s hands. (12)

The source of the bookseller’s interest is not far to seek: revenue from known sales created by the First Folio alone averaged over £2,000 per decade in the 1850s-70s, and reached over £6,000 in the 1880s and over £7,000 in the 1890s.

Not far into the century American demand began to affect the market. The earliest American purchase I have found is that of Francis Calley Gray of Boston, Lee 31, c. 1836. Indeed, as the literary centre of the United States till the end of the century, Boston is the most likely city in which one might expect to find a First Folio. However, an 1855 survey of libraries chiefly in and around Boston identified none. It describes many impressive collections, including Gray’s, but its four Shakespeare references are too imprecise to be helpful.\(^ {107}\) At least five copies, including Gray’s, had been purchased by Americans by 1850. The other four were Barton’s (1845, Lee 11/West 149), Chauncey’s (before 1849, Lee 118/West 151), Astor’s (1849, Lee 43/West 167) and Burton’s (c. 1850, Lee 145). At least nine more went to American buyers by 1860, including Lee 157 which foundered at sea ‘from the effects of a collision’ in 1854. Early American collectors seemed to regard a First Folio as indispensable. Of the eight early American collectors (Barton, Burton, Daly, McKee, Perry, White, Cochran and Wendell) covered at some length in Carl Cannon’s chapter

\(^{105}\) Pollard, 1915. The figures I cite give an indicative rather than a precise picture, since this British Library *List* is neither complete nor equally representative over the years.

\(^{106}\) I found four in two sales. See Appendix S/P 9, Table N, for 1871 and 1873.

\(^{107}\) Luther Farhnam, *A Glance at Private Libraries* (Boston, MA, 1855). A fifth reference is to ‘the best collection of Shakespeare’s editions, commentaries, illustrations, etc., to be found in the world’—in Barton’s library in Philadelphia (72, n). An 1860 survey of collections in New York—James Wynne, *Private Libraries of New York* (New York, 1860)—reveals nothing on First Folio sales or prices that is not already mentioned above or below. An 1878 survey of Californian libraries identifies no First Folio—Flora Haines Apponyi, *The Libraries of California* (San Francisco, CA, 1878)—though there were at least two facsimiles (189, 217) and one library had ‘ten editions of Shakespeare’ (113). However, not long after, Adolph Sutro of San Francisco purchased two Folios (Lee 138 c. 1883 and Lee 146 c. 1889).
on 'Shakespearean Beginnings', by which he meant the beginning of American collectors' interest in Shakespeare, all but the last included a First Folio in their collection. Luther Livingston records dollar Folio sales in 1860, 1883, 1889, 1891 and 1895. In 1876 Justin Winsor listed eighteen copies in the United States, and in 1888 William Fleming listed thirteen in New York City alone. Folger's purchases began to affect the market only later; he had bought but four copies before the turn of the century, all in the 1890s. However, by the end of the century, American demand was putting pressure on prices. Sidney Lee in 1899 quotes a letter he had recently received from Quaritch: 'Perfect copies are usually sold by us dealers to American collectors. They thus get scarcer and dearer every year.'

As it happened, the sale of the library of George Steevens in 1800, including his First Folio, was one of the first of the century. The sale of another great editor, Isaac Reed, followed in 1807, again including a First Folio. But the two sales that most affected the First Folio's reputation and prices were in 1812 and 1864. As Wheatley says, 'the Roxburghe sale in 1812 marks an era in bibliography' (147); it 'was one of the finest libraries ever brought to the hammer' (154), 'the apogee of patrician collecting'; the Folio for which the third Duke had paid a record price in 1790 fetched nearly three times as much at £100. High though this price is, it needs to be remembered that the Folio is not a very rare book. When rarity is involved it commands quite different premiums: in the same sale the 'Valdarfer Boccaccio' fetched £2,260, the first four-figure price paid for a printed book at auction, and Caxton's Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye £1,060/10/-.

John Carter, noting the disparity between the First Folio price and the Boccaccio price, commented that this sale 'was the last manifesto of a closing era of taste, in which the effective criteria of the great collectors were not so much literary as physical'. The other renowned and influential sale was that of George Daniel's Elizabethan and Shakespearean library, which De Ricci called 'one of the choicest in private hands'. It was sold in 1864, with its First Folio fetching nearly £300 more than the previous record ten years earlier. The price of £716/2/-, Wheatley remarked, 'had the effect of raising the price of all copies permanently' (223)---as we shall see below.

---

108 Carl L Cannon, American Book Collectors and Collecting from Colonial Times to the Present (New York, 1941). Although Cannon does not mention a First Folio in connection with McKee, the latter purchased Lee 140 in 1897.
110 Winsor, 87-90 (he actually listed nineteen, but one turned out to be a facsimile) and Fleming, 101-17. Both Winsor and Fleming give descriptions of the copies they list.
111 Sidney Lee, 'The Shakespeare First Folio: Some Notes and a Discovery', Cornhill Magazine, ns, no. 34 (1899), 449-58 (452).
112 Alan G Thomas, Great Books and Book Collectors (1988), 258.
113 De Ricci, English Collectors, 72, and a record which held for seventy-two years (Thomas, Great Books, 258).
115 Taste and Technique in Book-Collecting (New York, 1948), 5.
116 English Collectors, 148-49.
There is abundant evidence of varied demand for, and high interest in, the First Folio. In the first half of the century John Harris perfected his skill in producing facsimile pages to such a degree that even experts have been fooled. As Robert Metcalf Smith has pointed out, Harris's sale in 1857 of facsimile remainders (including several copies of the preliminary or last leaves of the First Folio) is evidence that Harris kept such pages in stock 'to supply the intermittent demands of the rare book trade'.

Smith also notes Halliwell-Phillipps's observation that Lilly the bookseller 'had nearly twenty copies at one time in the process of making up, all lacking the title page' (24). Aware of the demand for leaves, Sotheby's in 1887 suggested the appeal of a defective First Folio was that 'it would be useful for supplying imperfections in other copies (Catalogue 26 July, lot 655). Interest in the Folio is indicated by the fact that as many as five complete facsimile editions were published—in 1807, 1862-64, 1866, 1876, and 1888-89 (see the Appendix at the end of this work). In the 1870s Hazlitt, again not showing the customary reverence for the volume, attests to its prevalence and in his view its over-pricing when speaking of 'this common and absurdly overestimated volume'.

Towards the end of the eighties, the editor of *Book-Prices Current*, summing up the demand for books, placed 'Early editions of old English authors' as the fifth most sought-after category (following illustrated first editions, early works about America, specimens of old typography, and early works printed in Scotland). Within the category, he immediately says that the four Shakespeare folios 'always sell well, and are now becoming extremely scarce'. Commenting ten years earlier than Quaritch (quoted above), he gives as the reason for scarcity, not American demand, but 'every available copy being secured at any price for the Libraries'.

Table N in Appendix S/P 9 gives the details of First Folio sales and prices by year in the nineteenth century. Table O gives prices by year for Lee Class I Folios only. Table P in Appendix S/P 10 gives sales and prices of the Second, Third and Fourth Folios in the nineteenth century.

Table Q below, derived from Table N, shows the sales of First Folios by decade. The total for the century is 116. It is difficult to assess how many sales this misses, but the few that I have found in sources other than Lee suggest that it is reasonably complete. In any case it shows an impressive increase over the twenty-eight I found in the eighteenth century.

---

118 W Carew Hazlitt, *Collections and Notes 1867-1876* (1876), 380.
119 *BPC*, 11 (1889), vi.
The average rate of sale per decade in the second half of the nineteenth century (15.4) doubled that of the first half (7.8). The rate of sale accelerated at the end of the century, especially in the last two decades with twenty copies sold in the eighties and twenty-three (including four Folger purchases—Table V, Appendix S/P 11) in the nineties. (It would not be valid to compare these sales rates with those of the other three folios in Appendix S/P 10; the data in this appendix are only representative.)

Table Q below, also derived from Table N, shows the average price by decade for the century, including American prices. I believe all the prices in Table N are actual sales prices—that is, none is an offer, estimate or bought-in price. Based on such small samples, the averages in this and especially the next paragraph are only indicative. While the average price level of a First Folio was around £30 in the last decade of the eighteenth century, it was already nearly fifty percent higher, at £44, in the first decade of the nineteenth. Speaking of the book market, John Carter comments that we should not overlook that ‘the high prices of the Roxburgh sale [1812] period reflect the general inflationary economic conditions of the Napoleonic wars’. The average price was over thirty percent higher in the next two decades. It dropped back in the thirties, as did the number of sales: Richard Landon says ‘the demise of a number of the prominent members of the Roxburgh Club, combined with an economic depression, caused prices of books to fall drastically’; John Sutherland writes of the book trade crash in 1826. It then rose in each decade, especially in the sixties, till the end of the century. Perhaps it would have risen higher had it not been for the ‘ring’ or ‘knock-out’ which operated among some booksellers in the nineteenth century (and the first part of the twentieth century).

Table Q
Number of Sales of the First Folio by Decade in the 1800s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>00s</th>
<th>10s</th>
<th>20s</th>
<th>30s</th>
<th>40s</th>
<th>50s</th>
<th>60s</th>
<th>70s</th>
<th>80s</th>
<th>90s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The prices of copies known to be defective are excluded from the averages: Roscoe copy (1816), Lee 145 (1850), Pickering copy (1854), Lee 140 (1864), Lilly copies (1873), Lee 126 (1880), Lee 133 (1891 and 1892) and Lee 129 (1895).

Taste and Technique, 5.


Chapter 2, ‘The Ring’, Theory and Practice: A Digression, treats this subject in detail. ‘The earliest physical record of a major English rare book auction settled by dealers’ known to the Freemans is the R H Evans sale of 26 April 1830 (31). This ‘ring’ is mentioned again in Section G below (in the paragraph before Table EE).
Table R

Average Price of the First Folio
by Decade in the 1800s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00s</td>
<td>£44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10s</td>
<td>£60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20s</td>
<td>£63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30s</td>
<td>£26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40s</td>
<td>£90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50s</td>
<td>£121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60s</td>
<td>£305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70s</td>
<td>£315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80s</td>
<td>£341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90s</td>
<td>£410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average of £62 in the first half-century increased over five times to £320 in the second half. Undoubtedly, reports of high prices attracted more and more Folios out of obscurity.

Table S below, derived from Table O in Appendix S/P 9, shows the average or indicative price by decade of First Folios in Lee’s Class I only. (The figure for the first decade is single; the ‘average’ in the second decade is of only two figures.) By removing differences of condition insofar as is possible, this table permits price comparisons of Folios in roughly similar (as it happens the best) conditions. The difference between prices for Class I Folios and prices for the rest, i.e., the premium paid for Class I copies, is treated in Section G below.

Table S

Average or Indicative Price of Lee Class I First Folios
by Decade in the 1800s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00s</td>
<td>£38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10s</td>
<td>£111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20s</td>
<td>£88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40s</td>
<td>£125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50s</td>
<td>£180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60s</td>
<td>£565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70s</td>
<td>£516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80s</td>
<td>£526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90s</td>
<td>£833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The £103 average (versus £43 for all First Folios) in the first half-century more than quintupled to £522 (versus £143 in the second half, with eight copies in the last two decades selling for more than £400. These figures were capped by the spectacular price in the last year of the century of £1,700. In 1899 Lee said that ‘A fine copy of the First Folio is worth at least £1,000’. An analysis of the buyers and sellers of the volumes in Table N in Appendix S/P 9 gives some indication of who owned, who sold and who bought (excluding booksellers) First Folios in the nineteenth century. The picture is not complete, because it is based mostly on transactions where the price is known. A significant shift in ownership was the beginning of the move to institutional libraries; at least nine institutions received a Folio, and eight of these still have them. The preponderance of sellers and buyers were plain Mr, in part because all Americans were Mr. There were at least ten American buyers, the beginning of the other eventual major shift in ownership. However, among the sellers and buyers there were three Dukes, five Earls, one

124 These averages are of individual prices, not the average of the average per decade.
Marquis, one Baronet and a goodly representation of professional men. There was but one Mrs. A review of such works as Munby’s twelve-volume Sales Catalogues of Libraries of Eminent Persons revealed no First Folio owners among the literary figures of the nineteenth century whose libraries were sold: the sales of Byron, Scott, Southey, Wordsworth, Thomas Moore, Samuel Rogers, Macaulay, Peacock, Browning, Ruskin, Wilde and Swinburne contained no Shakespeare Folio, but Edward Fitzgerald and William Hazlitt, the bibliographer, each owned both a Second and a Fourth Folio. The story was different among actors: Garrick owned a First and a Second Folio; Kemble, all four Folios; Edmund Kean, a First and a Fourth; and Charles Kean purchased his father’s Fourth.126 Edmund Kean’s First was presented to him in New York in 1820.127 Perhaps this copy was the first in America; its presentation to Kean took place some sixteen years before the first American purchase I have found (c. 1836, as noted above). It was also presumably the first to be repatriated.

The First Folio, increasingly demanded as a collector’s item, continued to leave the other seventeenth-century Folios behind, as Table T below shows. The Second outdid the Fourth in both halves of the century. The Third, already ahead of the Second in the first half, continued its lead in the second half, showing the effect of rarity on value. It began to achieve three-figure prices in the 1860s, which the Second and the Fourth (with one remarkable exception) did not reach until the present century (see Table P in Appendix S/P 10). In 1899 Lee said ‘a fair price’ for a Second or Fourth Folio was £50, and for a Third Folio in good condition £250.128 In both the first and second half of the century, the First was in a price-class apart from the other three. From the Daniel sale on, if not from the Roxburghe, it made price history.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Prices of the Four Folios, First and Second Half of the 1800s129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Half-Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Half-Century</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for the four Folios together, at least by the end of the first quarter of the century, they were beginning to be regarded as a package. In 1824, the bookseller Thorpe advertised a set for £100 (or the First at £65, the Second at ten guineas, the Third at £25 and the Fourth at six guineas) and about the same time Pickering offered a set for

---

126 Munby, I, II, VI, VII, IX, and XII; vol I for Fitzgerald and Hazlitt; vol XII for actors.
127 Munby, Xll, 374.
129 The averages for the Second, Third and Fourth Folios are only indicative, being based on representative samples.
£95. In 1840 the Bibliothèque Nationale purchased the four Folios, as Lee says, each ‘for the modest sum of £20’ (1924, 101). There is a manuscript note in Meisei copy 7, giving a price for the four Folios on 13 June 1855 of £110. For the century as a whole I found twenty-nine cases where all three later seventeenth-century Folios were in the same sale as the First, sixteen of them in the second half. See Table U in Appendix S/P 10. A remarkable fact is that so many owners of a First Folio, even by the early years of the century, had also collected the other three. On the other hand, even by the later years of the century, the four were not offered in auction catalogues as a package (that is, in one lot) and were not often purchased by one buyer. If one compares the twenty-nine cases in the nineteenth century of the four Folios selling together with the four cases in Table L in Appendix S/P 7, one finds that a century later the premium paid for a First Folio over the Second and Fourth has increased greatly, and that the premium paid for a First over a Third—due to increasing recognition of the latter’s rarity—has somewhat decreased.

The First Folio held its own against most other volumes in all the most demanded classes of books. By the end of the century these included, in order of demand, early Bibles, first editions of the classics, early Italian literature, Caxton and other early English literature. For example, it took the combined drawing power of Caxton, Chaucer, *The Canterbury Tales*, as well as the first edition and much greater rarity, to compete in the 1890s at the level of £1,000, which as we saw above is what Lee said a good First Folio commanded. What *BPC* called ‘the better class standard and collector’s books’ averaged in 1893 £1/6/7 and in 1899 just under £3/-/-.* In 1899, *Works* of his contemporaries, the Shakespeare Folio stayed in a price class of its own. In the last five years of the century, Ben Jonson’s *Works* (1616) ranged from £116/- to £85/-; five averaged £4/13/-.. A Beaumont and Fletcher’s *Works* (1647) fetched £5. By contrast, the Gutenberg Bible, another book in a class of its own, had sold from 1873 to 1900 at least three times for between £500 and £760 and at least eight times for between £1,600 and £4,000; a vellum copy sold for £5,000. In the 1884 Thorold sale, where the First Folio fetched £590, the paper Gutenberg achieved £3,900. (For Gutenberg prices, see Chart 5 following the appendixes of this chapter.)

For the century as a whole, the rate of sale and the price level of the First Folio continued the upward movement seen in the latter part of the eighteenth century. Except for a relapse in the thirties, the average price advanced in each decade. At an average price in the last decade of £410 (in excess of £830 for Class I copies) it stayed well ahead of its successor Folios, though the price of the Third left that of the other two far

---

130 Wheatley, 224.
131 Ibid, 180 and 193.
132 *BPC*, XIII (1899), vii.
133 The five Jonson prices are from *BPC*, 1895 (items 3101 and 5654) and *BPC*, 1896 (items 602, 2910, 4322). The Beaumont and Fletcher price is from *BPC*, 1896 (item 553).
Plate 3. A *Punch* cartoon after the Burdett-Coutts sale in London, May 1922, when Rosenbach carried off the Daniel copy of the First Folio. It was acquired by Henry Folger in the same month.
behind. Compared to other books it became, during the century, one of the most sought-after and prestigious of collectables.

F 1900 TO THE PRESENT: SALES AND PRICES

By the turn of the century the Shakespeare world and the world of book sales had expanded to vast proportions. Only those factors in the immediate surroundings of the First Folio can be taken into account here—a territory by itself impressive in magnitude and variety. The Folio continued to make book history and to play a central role in Shakespeare scholarship. At the start of the century it became the focus of a scholarly drama from which emerged what we know as the ‘new bibliography’.

The role of the First Folio in the twentieth century was heralded in 1902 by the simultaneous publication of Sidney Lee’s Facsimile edition and his Census of Extant Copies in two impressive folio volumes.¹³⁴ (Their title-pages are reproduced on Plates 7 and 8.) Lee was the leading, established Shakespearean. His Life of Shakespeare, which went through sixteen editions by 1931,¹³⁵ had been published in 1898, and had helped give him ‘almost a monopoly of the Shakespeare industry in popular esteem’.¹³⁶ At the beginning of the century, he had begun searching for copies of the Folio, and devoted three years to the search. His Census was the first attempt to list all extant copies. Once the 158 copies in the Census and the fourteen copies in the Notes & Additions to the Census (1906) were recorded, with a number and a description to identify each copy, the First Folio had a unique place in the world. Its stature, derived from the author of its plays and the importance of its text, was enhanced by the recognition and means of ready-reference accorded by a descriptive census. Perhaps no other single book except the Gutenberg Bible has achieved such distinction.¹³⁷

It is impossible to measure the effect of scholarly attention to the First Folio on its position in the market place, but it is safe to assert that its academic importance was perceived at least by serious collectors like Folger and Huntington who demonstrably

¹³⁴ Lee, Facsimile and Lee, Census. A footnote in the Folio’s history is that Lee’s Census pioneered the use of the word ‘census’ in connection with books, as Lee himself claimed (Lee, 1924, 79). OED (1989) is silent on the usage of ‘census’ to enumerate books.
¹³⁵ The sixteen included an illustrated edition (1899) and an abridged edition (1900). The First Folio, a book, printed posthumously, was vital enough to occupy twenty-eight pages in the posthumous edition of Lee’s work about the life of the man.
¹³⁶ Wilson, 5. Schoenbaum applies the same word to ‘Lee’s domination of Shakespeare studies in his later years, a domination amounting almost to a monopoly’ (1970, 524).
¹³⁷ There was a listing of Gutenbergs in 1888 and there have been ten more up 1985. Owen Gingerich has made a census of the 1543 and 1566 Copernicus, which he has devoted to a book. In The Great Copernicus Chase (Cambridge, MA, 1992), he says ‘Surprisingly, only three other [than the Gutenberg Bible] major books have their locations listed with any serious claims to completeness: the first folio of Shakespeare . . . the elephant folios of Audubon’s birds, and now the first two sixteenth-century editions of Copernicus’s De Revolutionibus’ (77). Seymour De Ricci, A Census of Caxtons (Oxford, 1909) appeared soon after Lee’s Census, but was not devoted to a single title. The same is true of the volume that complements Lee’s Census, Henrietta C Bartlett and Alfred W Pollard, A Census of Shakespeare’s Plays in Quarto, 1594-1709 (1916; rev & extended, 1939).
affected the market. Henry Folger and his wife Emily, for example, were familiar with all the major scholarly works on Shakespeare. A key aspect of the Folio’s history in the twentieth century is its role in the new bibliography. As Lee represented late nineteenth-century Shakespearean scholarship, A W Pollard, W W Greg and R B McKerrow represented the new bibliography. An essential difference between the approaches was impressionistic speculation on the one hand and observed fact and analysis on the other. One example will serve to illustrate. Lee said ‘probably some presses of Jaggard’s friends were requisitioned for parts of the volume’; Pollard, citing, for example, the *fact* that all the rules are the same, countered that this was almost inconceivable.

In 1898, prefiguring the First Folio’s twentieth-century role in raising bibliographical questions and provoking scholarly scrutiny, Lee had brought to the first meeting of the Bibliographical Society devoted to the bibliography of Shakespeare and the Elizabethan drama the Sheldon-Burdett-Coutts copy of the Folio (now Folger 10), which contains both the cancellandum and the cancellans of the now-renowned last leaf of *Romeo and Juliet*. The later denouement illustrates the contrast between the two approaches to scholarship. Lee’s conclusions concerning what happened during editing and printing, accompanied by such pessimistic judgements as ‘the printers’ erratic procedure’ and ‘haphazard practices’, were ‘wide of the mark’. It was the new bibliographers who solved the problem of the printing order through painstaking observation, careful analysis and the application of superior knowledge.

One seminal event strikingly illustrates the role of the Folio in spurring the new bibliography. Lee’s Folio *Facsimile* Introduction was the pivot between the old and the new; it was both the unconscious swan song of the nineteenth-century scholarly

---

138 Blayney, 41.
139 The impact of this triumvirate can be illustrated through their role in two scholarly societies, the Bibliographical Society and the Malone Society, both of which from their inception, together with their publications, have been at the centre of modern bibliography. The Bibliographical Society had been founded in 1892. Its purposes included: ‘to promote and encourage study and research in historical, analytical, descriptive, and textual bibliography, and in the history of printing, publishing, bookselling, bookbinding, and collecting’—[Anon], *The Bibliographical Society, 1892-1992, A Century Send Forth* (1992), 5. Pollard was Secretary (1893-1912) and Joint Secretary with McKerrow (1912-34). McKerrow continued as Secretary until 1940. Greg was President (1930-32). All three were gold medallists of the Society. In 1919 the Society took over *The Library*, in existence since 1888; Pollard was editor or co-editor of *The Library* 1903-34, McKerrow 1935-37. The inception of the Malone Society in 1906 was largely due to Pollard (Wilson, 7). Its principal purpose was to produce ‘accurate copies of the best editions of early plays’—F P Wilson, *The Malone Society, the First Fifty Years: 1906-56*, *Collections*, 4 (London: Malone Society, 1956), 1-25 (2). Greg was the first General Editor, Pollard the first Treasurer, and McKerrow a member of Council. Greg continued as General Editor until 1939, producing a prodigious output of scholarly and influential work.
141 Lee, *Facsimile* Introduction, xxvii-xxix. The case against ‘the bibliographical pessimists . . . of whom Mr Lee has made himself the champion’ is stated powerfully by Pollard in the Preface to *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos* ‘in the name of . . . a healthy and hardy optimism’ concerning the practices of the editors and publishers (v).
142 Wilson, 41.
tradition and the immediate trigger for the new, personified by Greg and Pollard. Greg's personal copy of the Introduction to Lee's Facsimile is preserved with other items in a bound volume in the Morris Library of Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. The Morris Library kindly mailed this volume to the Folger Library for me to examine. Greg's judgement of Lee's contribution can be summarized by his marginal comments, which include: 'rubbish' (16 times), 'rot' (7), 'fanciful' or '(pure) fancy' (5), 'ass' (3), 'untrue' (3), 'tosh' (2), 'incorrect' (2), 'idiot!', 'no sense', 'more ignorance' and 'irresponsible fiction', with an overall assessment on the final page: 'Dreary pages of unimaginative fiction'. Greg's critique in The Library, challenging in particular what Lee says about copyright, manuscript sources and the printing of the Folio, was according to F P Wilson the first 'serious challenge' to Lee's authority. Pollard's ground-breaking Shakespeare's Folios and Quartos (1909) was written in reply to it. Pollard challenged Lee, for example, on his 'pessimism' concerning the integrity of the Folio text, for his assertion that Heminge, Condell and the Jaggards were 'erratic' and 'haphazard'. Dover Wilson (a 'brilliant disciple' of Pollard) sums up this crucial moment in literary scholarship: 'The revolution in English textual criticism was... directly provoked by Lee's unfortunate essay, which will go down in history as the last, and not the least dogmatic, statement of the traditional views about Shakespeare's text'.

The number of major studies, the subjects they covered, their scholarly quality and their centrality to the development of modern bibliography all demonstrate the ongoing role of the First Folio in twentieth-century scholarship. The mere mention of the study of press-variants, reappearing types, setting by forms or compositorial spellings and lineation at once brings the Folio to mind. There have been at least thirty-five works devoted, most of them exclusively, to the First Folio. These include eight printed and two electronic facsimile editions since 1900. No other book is even in the same league in generating such broad interest and in-depth study. I list here nine of the thirty-five. These works illustrate the central path of Anglo-American bibliographical development in this century.

---

143 W W Greg, manuscript notes (nd) in his copy of the Introduction to Lee, Facsimile, bound with Lee, Census, in the Morris Library, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.
144 'The Bibliographical History of the First Folio', Library, 1/15 (1903), 258-85.
145 Wilson, 5.
146 Ibid, 65.
147 J Dover Wilson, 'A New Way with Shakespeare's Texts: An Introduction for Lay Readers', Shakespeare Survey, 7 (1954), 48-56, (52). It became fashionable to ridicule Lee after Greg and Pollard challenged him. In 1955 Greg was still being heavily ironical in such comments as 'How easy it is to paint a graphic picture of the past unhindered by a knowledge of the facts!' (Greg, 87-88). It seems appropriate to balance the record a little. The Facsimile itself received the praise of no less a luminary than Charlton Hinman. In his Introduction to his own facsimile edition, he notes the prior publication of five photographic reproductions of the First Folio and continues: 'By much the best of these, and indeed the only one which can be regarded as a generally reliable representation of its original, is the Oxford or "Lee" collotype facsimile (Norton Facsimile, 1968, xxiii). Justly, Pollard called the companion publication Lee's 'valuable and interesting Census' (Pollard, 1909, 137).

R Crompton Rhodes, *Shakespeare's First Folio* (Oxford, 1923)


Alice Walker, *Textual Problems of the First Folio* (Cambridge, 1953)


---

For the sake of consistency and to avoid repetition in this note, full references to these nine works are given in the text. Excluding the facsimile editions (described in Appendix I), the other sixteen First Folio works are listed below. Arguably, some of these are no less important than some of the volumes cited in the text, but the latter are sufficient to illustrate the central path of bibliographical development.


[Luther Samuel Livingston], *The Four Folios of Shakespeare's Plays* (New York, 1907).


[________], *Compositors B and E in the Shakespeare First Folio* (Columbia, SC, 1976).


A further First Folio work is in progress. Akihiro Yamada, Meisei University, is preparing a transcription of the extensive early seventeenth-century (?) marginalia in Meisei 1, due to be published in 1998.
A remark on each will suggest their impact. F P Wilson says of Pollard's work that it was 'epoch-making in the history of the study of Shakespeare's text . . . a remarkable book' (13). Willoughby says Rhodes's work was among 'the most important' of studies called forth by the Folio's tercentenary. Gollancz's assemblage consists of seven studies by leading Shakespeareans on such subjects as Heminge and Condell, extant copies (Lee), the Elizabethan stage, the publishers and the editors. F P Wilson, writing in 1942, honours Willoughby's pioneering work as 'the most important book to the student of Shakespeare'; Greg in 1955 accepted its conclusions almost completely. (It was superseded by Hinman.) Helen Gardner speaks of the 'permanent value' of Alice Walker's 'remarkable series of articles'. Hinman assigns Greg's book its place of honour by simply saying Greg has long been 'our greatest authority' on Elizabethan dramatic manuscripts (1, 5). Again, Hinman, while noting the faults of The Great Folio, acknowledges its contribution: Schroeder 'first taught us how rewarding the study of box rules can be' in determining the order of printing (1, 169). Speaking of the 'newer bibliography' following Fredson Bowers, Helen Gardner says that its 'chief monument' is Hinman's 'definitive and magisterial work . . . that stands as a model for all similar investigations' into printing-house composition and proof-correction. Finally, in the nineties we come to Blayney's work: it summarises much of what we know about the Folio and at the same time advances our knowledge—for example, concerning the three issues of the Folio.

Both academic attention and public display affected perceptions of value, with an inevitable effect on sales and prices. If the foregoing studies represent the academic side of the Folio's twentieth-century history, exhibitions represent the public side. These broadcast its importance to all. There are copies on permanent display both at the Stratford Birthplace Trust and in the British Library, each seen annually by thousands. Any Shakespeare exhibition is incomplete without a First Folio. In 1916, the Victoria and Albert Museum celebrated the Shakespeare Tercentenary with an exhibition by displaying all three of its First Folios; the Grolier Club in New York by displaying the Roxburghe Folio; and the dealer Rosenbach by displaying the Earle Folios in Philadelphia. The First Folio was featured in an exhibition of books famous in English literature held in 1903 by the Grolier Club and duplicated sixty years later in

149 Willoughby, x. Greg was critical of Rhodes's book, but granted it 'occasional moments of insight'—Greg, xii.
150 Wilson, 37.
151 Greg, 433.
152 Helen Gardner in the Preface to Wilson, ix.
153 Ibid, x.
155 The Grolier Club, Catalogue of an Exhibition Illustrative of the Text of Shakespeare's Plays, As Published in Edited Editions (New York, 1916), 5.
156 Rosenbach: Biography, 97-98.
1963 by the Lilly Library in Indiana.\textsuperscript{157} In 1964, the Shakespeare exhibition at the National Portrait Gallery displayed a copy lent by the University of London.\textsuperscript{158} The culmination of the First Folio’s public appearances was the great Folger Exhibition in 1991, where it was the sole subject (for this Blayney wrote his work, the last in the list above).

As for the relationship between editing and owning a First Folio, we saw in the previous section that a separation had already occurred in the nineteenth century, and no twentieth-century scholar seems to have been an owner. Editors’ needs were satisfied in part by the increasing availability of original copies in public institutions and in part by the publication of facsimiles. In fact, one measure of interest in the Folio and at the same time evidence that its price was beyond the reach of scholars was the number of facsimiles published in this century. Lee’s Oxford \textit{Facsimile} (1902) was followed by the Methuen \textit{Facsimile} (1910), with the Methuen facsimiles of the other three seventeenth-century Folios preceding it. After a gap, three First Folio facsimiles were published in America—by Yale in 1954, Norton in 1968 (second edition in 1996), and Applause in 1995. In 1997, Routledge re-issued the Methuen facsimile. Highlighting the internationality of interest, Meisei University in Tokyo published a ‘compact’ facsimile in 1985. Demonstrating Shakespeare’s place in the modern world are three expensive electronic editions: two of these include facsimiles and one a keyed-in reproduction of the First Folio; profiting from the latest technology, all offer new possibilities for research and teaching. For a survey of facsimile editions, see Appendix I at the end of this work.

Not many books are granted centennials. Academia was offered the Gollancz volume, cited in the list above, to celebrate the three hundredth anniversary of the Folio’s publication.\textsuperscript{159} The public was offered dedicated exhibitions. The Cardiff Public Library ‘commemorated’ the occasion with an exhibition, displaying a copy which had been owned by Halliwell-Phillips;\textsuperscript{160} Southwark, aware of its former theatrical assets, likewise ‘commemorated’, displaying Folio fragments lent by Maggs;\textsuperscript{161} the Stationers’ Company did the same, displaying John Murray’s copy;\textsuperscript{162}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{157} David A Randall, ed., \textit{Grolier: or 'Tis Sixty Years Since, A Reconstruction of the Exhibit of 100 Books Famous in English Literature Originally Held in New York, 1903} (Bloomington, IN, 1963).
\item \textsuperscript{158} The Lilly Library displayed its own copy, formerly Mrs Rylands’s.
\item \textsuperscript{159} The tercentenary was the occasion for the publication of two other academic works: Alfred W Pollard, W W Greg, E Maunde Thompson, J Dover Wilson and R W Chambers, \textit{Shakespeare’s Hand in the Play of Sir Thomas More} (Cambridge, 1923) and Joseph Quincy Adams’s \textit{A Life of William Shakespeare} (London and Bombay, 1923), ‘the first serious rival to Lee’s biography’ (Schoenbaum, 1993, 504).
\item \textsuperscript{160} \textit{Catalogue of the Exhibition of Shakespeariana Held at the Cardiff Public Library in Commemoration of the First Folio Tercentenary} (Cardiff, 1923).
\item \textsuperscript{161} \textit{Shakespeare First Folio Tercentenary 1623-1923: Southwark Commemoration Exhibition Catalogue} (1923).
\item \textsuperscript{162} The catalogue is in the Stationers’ 1923 publication containing the re-setting of the preliminaries—cited above among the twentieth-century works on the First Folio.
\end{itemize}
and the British Museum 'celebrated', displaying four of its copies (the 'Guide' to the Exhibition included a weighty introduction by A W Pollard).

Two further Tercentenary events illustrate the Folio's place in society. On the academic side, the Stationers and the Shakespeare Association showed their adulation by publishing a re-setting of the Folio's preliminary leaves, as indicated in the title of their catalogue cited in the previous paragraph. On the public side, the other event unites the Folio with the theatre. The Old Vic timed the culmination of the ten years it had taken to perform all thirty-six plays to coincide with the tercentenary of the publication of the Folio.*

A few—more general—examples of the Folio's twentieth-century role will round out this attempt to create a context within which to examine its sales and prices. I choose the examples, some anecdotal, from diverse aspects of life to illustrate the Folio's appeal to the great variety of people in a wide variety of circumstances. In 1922, after the Burdett-Coutts sale in which Rosenbach bought both First Folios (his bid of £8,600 for the Daniel copy setting a new record), Punch featured the Folio in a cartoon. Uncle Sam is shown carrying a Folio away under his arm. The Droeshout portrait is such a universal icon that its familiarity is frequently employed to attract attention. The poster of the Literary Society and the English Department at University College London, for advertising their Christmas party in 1992, was a reproduction of the title-page portrait. The bubble emanating from the head had Shakespeare saying 'COME TO MY PARTY!' Perhaps not many books have a boat named after them, but Rosenbach called his boat 'First Folio II', presumably his second boat to be so honoured. The migration of copies to America has often been regretted, and their retention in the UK accordingly celebrated, perhaps most dramatically at the Carysfort sale in 1923: 'When Quaritch took the First Folio away from Rosenbach at £6100, the audience applauded with as much national fervor as if an invasion had been stemmed'.

One of the agreeable diversions in the course of my research was to chance upon a statue featuring the First Folio. It stands in the churchyard of the now-destroyed St Mary the Virgin, Love Lane, Aldermanbury, near London Wall in the City of London. Exuding adulation, the statue (1896) incorporates a marble sculpture (no less) of the First Folio. The book is open: one side presents most of the letter-press of the title-page, though no portrait, and

---

164 A Edward Newton eulogised that 'the great moment in the life of the Old Vic was . . . the eve of the tercentenary . . . when they gave Troilus and Cressida' (The Greatest Book in the World (1926), 85-86).
165 Rosenbach Biography, 158.
166 The portrait has attracted scholarly attention. The Spielmann work cited above is a detailed comparative study of the Droeshout Portrait and the Stratford monument, the 'only two portraits of the Poet [which] can be regarded as authentic' (1). The book has forty-seven plates which include illustrations of the successive states of the Droeshout portrait, both in the First Folio and in its three successor volumes.
167 Rosenbach Biography, 321. An illustration shows the boat in about 1938 (following p 288).
168 Ibid, 185.
the other an extract from the Dedication. There is a bust of Shakespeare on top and plaques on the sides below which celebrate Heminge and Condell. A century later a tablet at the entrance to the new Ritblat Gallery (opened in April 1998) 'commemorates with gratitude the devoted labours' of Heminge and Condell. Then, astonishingly, the First Folio was cited in the 1950s as evidence that Marlowe was the author of the plays. The logic, if any, is perverse, but Calvin Hoffman concluded that 'if anything, the First Folio is a compelling reason for denying Shakespeare's authorship of it, and for affirming Christopher Marlowe's'. In 1973, Geoffrey Grigson wrote a poem, 'The First Folio': in it he addresses Shakespeare, wondering what to read first if he overcomes his hesitation to open a parcel containing a facsimile edition. Finally, a reminder of the Folio's importance as a textual source for the Shakespeare we read and see on the stage today seems in order. For the works included in the recent Oxford edition, the First Folio is the sole control-text for twenty-one plays and the primary control-text for another seven.

We turn now to sales and prices in the twentieth century by looking first, and in detail commensurate with its importance, at the 'Folger phenomenon'--the purchase by one man of some eighty-two copies of the First Folio during thirty-five years between about 1893 and 1928. Folger's purchasing of--in the end--over one third of the 228 extant copies is the most significant event in the Folio's sales history. The collection has no rival. The next largest, at Meisei University, Tokyo, formed much later (1975 to 1991/92), has twelve copies. Folger's accumulation of such a large number and proportion of copies of a great book is unique in the history of book-collecting.

The Folger collection furnishes yet another example of the central role of the First Folio in the study of bibliography in general and of Shakespeare in particular. For example, if Hinman had not had the possibility of comparing many copies in one place, he could hardly have made his discoveries concerning the printing of the Folio--including printing by formes, the order of printing, the Troilus story, and the elapsed time taken to print the whole. As we saw above, his study became a model influencing all bibliography. At the same time, the Folger Library has become the world's foremost

---

169 A pre-war photograph of the statue is reproduced in William Bailey Kempling, *The Shakespeare Memorials of London* (1923), with the south wall of the then extant church as backdrop (after p 16). Kempling says that the designer and donor was a certain Charles Walker of Shropshire. He also documents the many associations of Hemeinge and Condell with the parish and with the church (30-31).

170 Quoted by Halliday, *Cult of Shakespeare*, 202, from Calvin Hoffman, *The Man Who Was Shakespeare*--i.e, Marlowe--(1955). At least one prominent Baconian owned a First Folio (now in the University of London Library)--Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, who presumably used it when writing and selecting plates for his *Bacon is Shakespeare* (1910), discussed by Halliday (183-85).


173 Traditionally, the Folger Shakespeare Library is said to hold seventy-nine copies of the Folio. In Chapter 5 and in my article, 'How Many First Folios Does the Folger Hold?', *SQ*, 47 (1996), 190-94, I argue that the holding is eighty-two copies.
centre for renaissance literary studies, with the Shakespeare Folios the esteemed core of its collection.

In my research in the Folger archives I came across a list which gives the prices Folger paid for his Folios. To my knowledge, it has not been published. With it I can give a detailed picture of Folger's purchases isolated from the buying and selling activities of others. Without it I would not have known most of the prices he paid. As explained in detail in the introduction to Appendix S/P 11, cross-referencing the data in this list with data from other sources enabled the construction of Table V in Appendix S/P 11. The table gives a full picture by date of sale of Folger's purchases and the price he paid for each copy. To reduce his purchases to the barest statistic: during three decades he bought an average of over two-and-one-half Folios per year. The purchasing was steady, with roughly the same number in each decade (twenty-five, twenty-nine and twenty-four respectively), though there were of course peak years (eight copies in 1903 and seven in 1910).

While it is easy to be impressed by the volume of Folger's purchases, it is difficult to assess their impact on the upward movement of prices. We can learn much about Folger's approach to purchasing Folios by looking at both sides of the question of his influence on prices. On the one hand, when an increasingly well-known buyer purchases--for a period of over thirty years--more than one out of every two examples sold of an item in high demand, one can assert with assurance that this must raise prices. Such an assertion is supported by some of the purchasing methods he used. For example, worthy of an executive who rose to the top of the Standard Oil Company, he was not satisfied to wait for copies to come on the market. True to his practice as an oil-man, he initiated exploration for them. In May 1915, he wrote to A H Mayhew in Charing Cross Road giving him a list of thirty-five Folio owners from Lee's Census. He commissioned Mayhew to write to each of them to 'ask whether his copy is for sale, and if so what value he puts on it'. Certainly, with methods like that, despite his caution Folger became known as an avid buyer among booksellers and this could hardly have failed to inflate the prices they asked. In addition, when he really wanted a volume, such as the Vincent copy, for which he paid the extraordinary price of nearly $50,000, the second highest he ever paid, as early as 1903, he seemed to be prepared to pay whatever it took. To the extent that this purchase became known, even though it was exceptional, it must have boosted prices. The fact that he spent almost as much on First Folios in the first three decades as all the other buyers put together is further evidence of his upward pressure on prices.

---

174 See 'Folger Price List' in List of Cue Titles.
175 Folger 80 was purchased in 1926 and I have made the assumption that Folger 81 was bought in the same year as 82, that is, 1920.
176 Letter from Henry Folger (no signature or typed name) to A H Mayhew, bookseller, Charing Cross Road, 17 May 1915, in Case File 1996, Folger Shakespeare Library.
177 The saga of the purchase of this volume, during four years of ever-escalating offers, is told in detail by Blayney, 44-45.
On the other hand, there were a number of countervailing factors. First, Folger bought very carefully. In the first two decades he paid less on average for a copy than other buyers. Folger's average price was £812 (£440 if one excludes the Vincent copy) in the 1900s and £1,017 in the 1910s; the average all other purchasers paid in the same two decades were respectively £1,518 and £2,008. One needs to be cautious in using these figures as evidence of his buying skill, because the average condition of his copies may well have been less good than the average condition of the other copies that changed hands. This could account for some of the difference. In any case, in the 1920s, probably in part because he was buying better copies, he paid a higher average price than others—£3,782, as compared to £3,165. Second, buying through agents like Mayhew, Quaritch, Rosenbach, and Gabriel Wells, he kept his name out of the market. Even in the letter cited in the previous paragraph, lest Mayhew get the wrong impression, he disarmingly began: 'I need one more First Folio to bring my collection where I wish it'. After this, in fact, he bought thirty-three more. On another occasion he wrote that Quaritch is 'always higher in price than all other London dealers, so that I can buy but little from him'. Third, despite his avidity, he was willing to let a copy go if he thought it overpriced. This was the case with one of the offers Mayhew elicited. Folger wrote to Mayhew that the suggested price of £1,900 'is of course prohibitive... The copy isn't worth a quarter of what they ask for it'. Fourth, he bargained. The effect on price is exemplified by the reduction he gained from $1,600 to $1,250 for the lot including Folger '82'. Fifth, he not only bargained before buying, but, if he was not satisfied, he challenged the price after buying: before buying Folger 29 he got £100 off the catalogue price; after buying, he got a further £100 off. Sixth, Folger kept quiet about his purchases and holdings. Lee, the expert on Folio whereabouts, thought J Pierpont Morgan was the largest owner in 1902, with three copies (Census, Introduction, 16); he credits Folger with only one copy in the 1902 Census when he already owned six. In May 1906, Lee knew of only eight Folger copies, whereas Folger already held twenty-three. In 1924, Lee thought Folger had thirty-five copies (1924, 103); in fact he had fifty-seven. His discretion about his purchases and his holdings protected price. A final factor was the nature of Folger's competition. Of those that could compete in wealth, none combined such care in purchasing with an almost fanatical desire for copies. Thus he had no persistent rivals. Huntington for one, who desired only a few, excellent copies, was not interested in quantity. Marsden Perry, for another, who at one time had grand ambitions for a

---

179 For more details on this incident, see copy 225 in the Census in Chapter 7.
180 For more details on the purchasing of this volume, see the penultimate paragraph of Appendix D 2 in Chapter 5.
181 The details are given in the footnote to the 'Maggs' copy bought in August 1910--Table V, in Appendix S/P 11.
Shakespeare collection, retired from the field, apparently in defeated discouragement when outbid in 1914 by Huntington for the Devonshire Quartos. He sold his collection, some of it to Folger, saying 'I will not take second place'. In sum, the factors cited in this paragraph mitigated Folger's effect on prices, but the factors cited in the previous paragraph undoubtedly pressed prices up, though not very noticeably till the twenties—as we shall see.

Such methods and quantity of purchasing formed a force in the market place of which we need to be mindful as we view overall sales and prices in the twentieth century. Appendix S/P 12 gives First Folio sales and prices from 1900 to the present: Table W gives a detailed record, as a basis for analysis and as a resource for interested scholars; Table X, derived from Table W and from Table V in Appendix S/P 11 (the Folger purchases), gives a summary of prices by year. Table Y below shows the number of sales by decade. The rate of sales had been twenty-one and twenty-four respectively in the 1880s and 1890s. It leaped to an average of nearly fifty in the first three decades of this century, with Folger accounting for over half. There was then a drop-off, with never more than seventeen sales in a decade since. There have been only six (involving five copies) so far in the nineties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Y</th>
<th>Number of Sales of the First Folio by Decade in the 1900s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00s</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10s</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20s</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30s</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40s</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50s</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60s</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70s</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80s</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90s</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, then, the four decades from the 1890s to the 1920s saw the most trading. The peak years were 1922 with twelve sales and 1903, 1910 and 1911 with nine each. It seems clear that Lee's searches and the publication of his Census intensified sales activity. Further evidence of Lee's impact on the market is the fact that six of the fourteen copies which he discovered between 1902, when his Census went to press, and 24 May 1906, the closing date for entries in Lee, 1906, were sold in the years 1904 to 1906.

183 Cannon, American Book Collectors, 328.
184 To count the number of sales in Table W, I excluded both those which were bought-in or have an estimate or offer price and some thirty-eight copies (including three defective ones) which within two (in one case three) months became Folger copies. I count these thirty-eight transactions each as one sale, since it seems likely that on all or most occasions the buyer was acting as Folger's agent or with the expectation that Folger would purchase the volume. Clearly, this treatment of these transactions affects the numbers significantly. To the sales from Table W, I added the seventy-eight copies Folger purchased in the twentieth century which are listed in Table V, including the three copies, Folger 80 to 82.
185 I assume the Garden set was sold twice (for details, see Appendix S/P 12, Table W, 1993-94).
If one looks at how Folios changed hands, the role of the auction houses is central. Sotheby’s, founded in 1744, specialised in books until this century and became the principal channel for selling and buying Folios. Christie’s has also been an important channel. Its first book sale in Munby and Coral is in 1770 and its name was associated twice with the auctioning of Folios at the end of the eighteenth century (see Appendix S/P 5 for 7 September 1781 and 16 February 1785). However, Christie’s sold few books in the nineteenth century; in fact, Christie’s ‘passed most of the books they received on to Sotheby’s’, while Sotheby’s passed on ‘all pictures of any quality’ to Christie’s. In America, Folios were sold through the two great New York auction houses, American Art Association and Anderson Galleries (which as Anderson Auction Company launched itself into books in 1911 by handling the famous Hoe sale with its two First Folios and two Gutenbergs). These two houses combined in 1929. They sold between them in this century at least twelve First Folios. After their demise in 1939, their place was taken by Parke-Bernet (founded in 1937), which sold at least eleven before its alliance with Sotheby’s in 1964. In this century, Sotheby’s have sold over one hundred First Folios, Christie’s at least thirteen and auction houses other than those just mentioned at least another nine.

At the same time, First Folios tended to be the speciality of certain booksellers. There is evidence in Table W alone that Quaritch bought (or sold) nearly fifty copies, Rosenbach and Wells about fifteen each, Maggs eleven and John Fleming ten. While these figures include some copies more than once, they by no means represent the totals these dealers handled. In Wells’s case, for example, Wesley Turner comments that ‘no fewer than thirty’ passed through his hands.

Turning now to prices, we see in Table Z below (derived from Table X in Appendix S/P 12) average prices by decade. To refine the averages, a substantial number of prices—for example, for particularly defective copies—was excluded from Table X as explained in its introduction. The average price in the first two decades was just above £1,000 and in the next three decades around £3,000. Though there appear to have been no sales at all in 1929-30, the depression seems not to have retarded the average

---

186 Herrmann, Sotheby’s, 137.
187 For American Art Association, Anderson Galleries and Parke-Bernet, see Wesley Turner, The Elegant Auctioneers (1971), esp 8 and 532; the Hoe sale, 258-80.
188 Elegant Auctioneers, 312. Wells bought a great deal of Shakespeare for Folger (313).
189 A knowledgeable gloss on Folio collectors’ priorities in the 1920s is offered by Dr Rosenbach: ‘Today [1927], when the condition of a book is everything and collectors pay more attention to it than to anything else, fine first folios of Shakespeare are judged by these three points: First, the copy must have its full number of leaves, each page perfect, without facsimile. Second, the binding. It is, of course, more desirable in the original binding, or, next, rebound in the eighteenth century, or, lastly, in a good modern binding. In years to come the original binding will be the chief of all desiderata. Third, the folio must be of adequate size, about thirteen by eight and a quarter inches. A quarter of an inch one way or another can spell tragedy to the fanatical collector’ (A S W Rosenbach, Books and Bidders: The Adventures of a Bibliophile (1928), 86). Rosenbach judged his buyers with sensitive skill: in 1922, he purchased the Plant set of four Folios for $22,000 and promptly sold the First Folio alone to Frank Bemis for $30,000; in 1932, he bought another set of four for $45,000 and sold them straight away to Arthur Houghton for $75,000 (see Table W for these two years).
price. It advanced in the thirties, but as one might have expected declined in the forties. Perhaps surprisingly it declined again in the fifties. The take-off began in the sixties: the average in that decade was over £9,000 and in the seventies over £17,000. If we judge by the number of copies remaining in private hands by the end of the seventies, the First Folio in terms of likely availability had at last become a rare book. This clearly pushed prices up, but we also need to remember that inflation peaked in the seventies, affecting not only the price of copies sold in the UK but also dollar and yen prices. (The effect of inflation is covered in the next section.) In the eighties, prices shot up. Four of the top prices were between £270,000 and £691,000. When Lee 22 (West 205) achieved the second highest price of $580,000 (= £411,348) in April 1985, ‘several hands [were] waving in the $400,000 to $500,000 region’. The £691,000 price, 56% (the same arbitrary percentage as used elsewhere) of the sum for the Garden set of four Folios bought in New York in November 1989 for $1.9 million, remains the record. One gets a sense of the times from a comment by William Rees-Mogg, ‘The three great New York sales of recent years [of which the Garden was one] marked a major surge in the auction prices of great books’. However, after the eighties the mood in the auction markets reversed. The antiques and paintings markets crashed in the autumn of 1990. The first two Folio auction prices recorded in the nineties reflected the change: £95,000 and £50,000 (for West 210 and 211 respectively), even when the condition of the two copies is taken into account. The Book Collector commented on the £95,000 for Lee 130, the Congreve copy: ‘A modest price’. In 1991, the Garden set which had achieved $1.9 million two years earlier, failed to reach its reserve of $1.2 million and The Book Collector judged this reserve as high. Perhaps some recovery in the market is indicated by the £140,000 bid for West 174 in 1996.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>00s</th>
<th>10s</th>
<th>20s</th>
<th>30s</th>
<th>40s</th>
<th>50s</th>
<th>60s</th>
<th>70s</th>
<th>80s</th>
<th>90s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00s</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>368.1</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average price in the first six decades ranged from £1,200 to £3,800. By contrast, jumping in the sixties and seventies, it peaked at nearly £370,000 in the eighties. In the nineties (an average of only four prices) it was around £150,000.

---

190 Otness comments that A E Newton’s sale of Lee 6 in October 1941 for $22,000 was one of the few losses on a First Folio; he had earlier paid $62,000 (75).
As in Section E above, we can make somewhat more accurate price comparisons by considering only premium copies, that is, those in Lee’s Class I, to give a price-picture with differences of condition removed insofar as possible. Table AA in Appendix S/P 12 presents these prices for the century. Table BB below shows the average or indicative price for each decade. The ‘average’ is of only two figures in the thirties, forties, sixties and seventies. The figure for the eighties is single.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Average or Indicative Price (£000) of Lee Class I Folios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00s</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10s</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20s</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30s</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40s</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50s</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60s</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70s</td>
<td>411.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80s</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90s</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sum, premium copies of the Folio ranged between £2,200 and £6,300 in the first five decades. The two in the sixties went for over £26,000 and nearly £13,000, the two in the seventies for £15,000 and--a large leap--nearly £77,000, and the one in the eighties rocketed to over £410,000.

It is no surprise, with Folio volumes fetching such prices, to find fragments, too, exerting a pull on the market. To take two samples for single plays, Maggs Bros offered ten, mostly incomplete, plays in 1931: the prices were within the range of £5/5/- (Julius Caesar 6 pp, Richard III 8 pp) to £31/10- (Measure for Measure, complete, 24 pp, in buckram case), with the exception of £75 for a complete Antony and Cleopatra (29 pp, bound by Rivière). The second sample is from ABPC volume 96 (1990), which reports the sale of eight fragments. The price of a play (approximate sterling equivalent given for dollar prices), with the exception of Macbeth and Hamlet, ranged between nearly £1,000 (Richard II) and £2,000 (I Henry IV). Macbeth and Hamlet together fetched nearly £8,300. Single leaves also now fetch fancy prices. In 1983, one leaf of ‘an unrecorded seventeenth-century prompt-book’ of Hamlet from a First Folio, pages 265-66, brought £3,200 at Sotheby’s. In 1991, a firm called Georgetown Galleries in Bethesda, Maryland, offered (in a document rife with errors) seventy-five leaves from seven plays: middle leaves (approximate sterling equivalent) ranged from £860 to £1,800, ‘famous passage’ leaves from £1,800 to £3,600, and title-pages from £2,900 to £5,300.

An analysis of sellers and buyers shows several general shifts. Many of the copies came from titled English families, right up to the sales in 1990 and 1991. Starting already in the nineteenth century, the principal buyers were American. Typically they were extremely wealthy and great collectors; often they were bibliophiles. In addition

195 Maggs Bros, English Literature & History, Catalogue 563, a Second Supplement to Catalogue 550, (September 1931), lots 332-41.
196 Sotheby’s, Parke, Bernet, English Literature, Catalogue, 21 July 1983, lot 28.
to Folger, one thinks of James Lenox, J P Morgan, Henry Huntington, Marsden Perry, and Carl Pforzheimer. A third major shift was from private to institutional ownership (often, of course, due to gift or bequest, rather than purchase). Finally, beginning in the 1960s there has been a shift to Japan. There are now fifteen copies there, including the twelve at Meisei University.\textsuperscript{197}

As for the other three seventeenth-century Folios, Table CC in Appendix 13 gives sales and indicative prices for decennial years and for the first five years in the nineties. In numbers of sales, the pattern is broadly the same as for the First Folio. The peak year was in the first decade; sales declined after 1920/21. On price the most notable occurrence was the leap in the eighties. Prior to 1980/81, only one of the three Folios had sold for significantly more than £400 (a Third Folio in 1920/21 for £1,039). From 1980/81, all prices were in the thousands, with one Third and two Fourths each going for highs of £16,000 or more, and three Seconds respectively for highs of £19,250, £32,895 and £26,315.

By the present century it had become the custom to sell and buy the four seventeenth-century Folios as a set. I have found thirty-four such sales, twenty-nine of them with prices, and one offer with a price. The sales dates and prices are shown in Table DD in Appendix S/P 13. Twenty-two of the sales occurred in the first half of the century and twelve in the second half. The average price of the package (excluding the offer) in the first half was around £5,900 and for the five in the fifties and sixties about £12,000. For the two sales since 1965, the most recent price (1990) was nearly £550,000, and the price in 1989 of £1.23 million for the Garden set is a record in a category of its own. This set has changed hands twice since, but I have not discovered at what prices.

For creating some measure of comparison for First Folio prices, I used the following criteria to identify reasonably comparable works: books by well-known writers, folio in format, roughly contemporary, and enough sales in the last two decades to provide a reasonably large sample. The application of these criteria led to the selection of the following works by two writers: Jonson (\textit{Works}, 1616 and 1616-1641) and Raleigh (\textit{History of the World}, 1614 and 1634). Obviously, the content and appeal of the Jonson make it a better comparison than the Raleigh. According to \textit{BAR}, in these two decades the Jonson folio of 1616 exceeded £1,000 four times with a top price of £1,831; the Jonson \textit{Works} of 1616-1641 exceeded £2,000 four times with a top price of £3,614; the Raleigh \textit{History} of 1614 exceeded £1,000 three times with a top price of £2,139, excluding a unique copy with Raleigh's autograph inscription; and the Raleigh 1634 exceeded £550 on one occasion with the price of £900. In the same two decades, Samuel Daniel's \textit{Works} (1601, 1602), \textit{A Panegyric} (1603) and \textit{History of England} (1621/22, 1634) achieved more than £1,000 only four times, one of which.

\textsuperscript{197}The shifts in ownership and geography from the beginning to the end of this century are covered in detail in Chapter 6 and in my article, "The Number and Distribution of Shakespeare First Folios 1902 and 1995", \textit{AEB}, ns, 9 (1995), 1-23.
Plate 4. Statue in Love Lane in the City of London, celebrating Heminge and Condell and their volume. Photograph by the author.

Plate 5. Marble version of the First Folio (on the above statue). Photograph by the author.
was for Charles II's copy of the *History*. And these prices were during the years when the pound prices of five First Folios were in the hundreds of thousands, all nine averaged over £270,000 and only one sold for as little as £50,000. One could argue that the closest comparison of all is between the prices of the folio first editions of two contemporary dramatists, published only seven years apart. Simple comparison of the average prices of their two first editions suggests a Jonson/Shakespeare multiple in these last two decades of well over 400. By contrast, when one brings into the scales such considerations as the first book printed with movable type, beauty of printing and rarity, Shakespeare bows to Gutenberg. No Gutenberg in this century has sold for under £2,000, but sold for as much as £61,000 as early as 1926, and in 1978, when the highest First Folio price was around £77,000, three Gutenbergs went for an average of about £1.3 million. (The trend of Gutenberg prices is shown in Chart 5 after the appendixes at the end of this chapter.) In 1989/90, single Gutenberg leaves typically sold in the range of £5,000 to £7,000 (sterling equivalent), and twelve leaves fetched the equivalent of approximately £230,000. A single vellum leaf fetched about £41,000. A glance from yet another standpoint—the Quartos—further helps to see the Folio in perspective. In his autobiography in 1978 H P Kraus sums up: “The Folios, though desirable, are only of moderate rarity. They can be obtained whenever one is able to pay the price. To buy Shakespeare Quartos, those fragile little publications sold originally for a shilling outside the theater, is quite another matter”.198

To summarise for the century: the forces already affecting sales and prices of the First Folio as it came into the twentieth century were joined by at least four new influences which derived from four separate but interrelated events. These were Lee’s search for copies and the publication of his *Census*, the volume’s central role in modern bibliography, the extensive purchases by Henry Folger, and the reduced number of copies, especially after the twenties, available for purchase. During the century the First Folio so enhanced its reputation as a collectable that by the eighties it had effectively priced itself out of private ownership. Prices that were in the £100s and single £1,000s in the first decades rose to tens of £1,000s and in the eighties peaked in the hundreds of £1,000s. The average price 1980-96 was over a quarter of a million pounds.

**G FIRST FOLIO SALES AND PRICE TRENDS**

‘During the last fifty to sixty years price history has matured into a well-established branch of economic history’, Herman Van der Wee wrote in his Foreword to a volume dealing with financial currents in Europe.199 The historian of the book may not find a

---

great deal on prices in bibliographical literature to aid and illuminate investigation, analysis and long-term comparison, but there is plenty—both of theory and of statistics—to draw from in the field of economic history of the last two generations. Van der Wee goes on to bemoan, despite the maturity of the study of prices, the ‘doubts and gaps’ which remain. He cites in particular ‘the need for more market-representative data and more homogeneous series of price data.’ Fortunately, with the First Folio, we can come close to satisfying both these needs. From at least the late eighteenth century, we have ample data to meet the need of ‘market representation’ (prices arrived at between a willing seller and a willing buyer, reliable and accurate figures, large enough samples—for most of the period—for statistical validity). And, dealing as we are with one edition of one book, we more or less meet the need of ‘homogeneity’ in the series of price data—‘more or less’ because, although it is but one book, we only sometimes have information to enable us to take into account differences of condition, binding, and other factors which affect value. Even here, however, we are fortunate: in the last two centuries, we can come close to ‘homogeneity’ by viewing the prices of Lee Class I Folios in separate series on their own. The solutions to other theoretical or statistical problems (using appropriate time-spans, trend-lines, scatter diagrams, long-term indices, relevant indices, deflators, etc) are dealt with as they arise below.\footnote{I should like to acknowledge and express my appreciation for the advice of Ian Crawford of the Institute For Fiscal Studies on questions in economics and statistics.}

This section presents the long-term sales and price trends of the First Folio, compares the price trends to available indices and takes account of inflation. For the most part British statistics are used when it comes to choosing indices and dealing with inflation (for the early part of our period there is no alternative). This is consistent with the approach in the rest of the chapter where prices are converted to sterling. However, it has to be recognised that from the late nineteenth century the American market is, or more, relevant to First Folio traffic than the English market, except to the extent that one can argue that the rare book market was, or became, one (international) market. Lee in 1902 saw no distinction: he gives a price range as *either in New York or London*\footnote{Census Introduction, 10—my emphasis. Lee covers the subject of Folio prices in the Introduction, 8-10 and 15, and in Lee 1924, 96-99. Introducing the topic of the rise in ‘pecuniary value,’ he calls it ‘the more sordid details’—96—but pursues the subject with evident relish. Interest in his assessment is heightened by the fact that he made it at a significant moment in the Folio’s history—the Tercentenary year. Henry Guppy covers the subject in his Brief History of the ‘First Folio’ (26-28), though he relies mostly on Lee, adding little new.}

As in the preceding sections, numbers of sales come before prices. Chart 1 shows number of sales by decade, starting in the 1740s, which was the first decade in which more than one sale is recorded, and ending in the 1990s. It presents a picture of the history of sales, useful as a backdrop against which to view the price trends which...
follow. The four markers joined by a line graphically illustrate the dimensions of Henry Folger’s purchases during the four decades he was buying.

![Chart 1: Sales of First Folios by Decade 1740s-1990s](image)

In choosing the length of time-spans within which to view price data, one needs a sufficient length to detect a definite direction and rate of change, yet not so long as to mask important intermediate changes. In the case of the Folio, the first time-span chooses itself by the paucity and questionable reliability of data—1623 to c. 1760 or 1790. It is not until the late eighteenth century that we begin to get enough (sufficiently reliable) data to be able to make solid generalisations on prices. The little we can say about the first period can be quickly sketched. The publication price was between 15/- and £1, depending on the binding. The price was probably lower than these figures throughout the seventeenth century, given what we know about Shakespeare’s reputation, cultural values during the Puritan period, and the perception of the Second, Third and Fourth Folios as ‘better’ editions. The only two prices I have found would corroborate this—14/- in 1687/88, 18/- in 1699. The new century was heralded by a price of £1/6/-, but there is then a gap of about forty years before we get prices of 15/- (for a copy without a title-page) and 8/- (for an ‘imperfect’ copy) in 1740, then £10 in 1750 and £3/3/- in 1756. Any temptation to make firm generalisations from these data is thwarted by the fact that only one of the prices is unquestionably reliable: the £3/3/- in 1756 is a documented price for an identified Folio arrived at between a willing seller
and a willing buyer. It is the first such price I have found since the time of publication.

One could argue for starting the second time-span with the 1760s because this is the first approximate decade in which we have as many as four prices. However, there are a number of factors which would diminish the validity of a trend-line beginning c. 1760. First, only one of these four figures (£5/10/- in 1765) is completely reliable; second, in the twenty-five years from 1765, there is a virtual gap of data—only four prices; and third, of these four prices two are not ‘homogeneous’, being for imperfect copies. By contrast, there are as many as seven prices (excluding two imperfect copies) in the 1790s alone, at least four of which have the standard of reliability of the £3/3/- in 1756—ie, these are ‘market representative’ and are a much firmer beginning for a trend-line. Furthermore, the first price in 1790 marks a discontinuity, a sudden leap in price. Speaking of a phenomenon that later became known in economics as autocorrelation, De Ricci observes,

When a book has once sold for an enormous price and another copy turns up unexpectedly, the price of the new example is always strongly influenced by the former record. Such fancy prices are not, as many people believe, sporadic instances of an individual collector’s excitement, but have in many cases a permanent influence on the book-market of the world. (De Ricci, 1921, xii)

Lee makes the same point, speaking of this particular record: ‘it inaugurated a higher scale of increase’. Accordingly, a logical place to begin a new time-span is with such a leap in price. To sum up the Folio’s prices in this first period—defined now as ending in 1787, the year of the price previous to the leap in 1790—we can say that for about 125 years the volume probably sold mostly for less and perhaps occasionally for more than its publication price. In the mid-eighteenth century it began to enter the market-place more regularly as seen in Chart 1 above, with its price beginning to move up in the 1750s and 1760s. The average of the four prices in the 1760s was £5/8/-.

After the virtual gap, the (reliable) price of £10 in 1787 was the turning point, anticipating—perhaps spurring—the new price levels of the 1790s.

A way of viewing the relative prices of the Folio in this first period, and also of glancing ahead, is to make comparisons with the contemporary price of bread. According to B R Mitchell bread prices are about the only available price series of any length till the nineteenth century. The average price for four pounds of household bread in London in 1623 was 5.4 pence. Thus, if we take a loaf of four pounds as a unit of value, Sir Edward Dering in December that year paid the equivalent of forty-four loaves for one of the newly-published Folios (presumably bound in plain calf). To the

---

202 The reasons for questioning the reliability of the other prices mentioned here are given in Sections C and D above.


204 British Historical Statistics (Cambridge, 1988), 716. Table 22, pp 769-70, gives the annual average price of wheaten or household bread in London in pence per four pounds 1545-1925.
extent that the Folio prices we have for 1687/88, 1689 and 1740 are reliable, the equivalent in bread for those years was thirty-eight, forty-one and twenty-eight loaves respectively. This price performance correlates with what we have seen was the perception of the Folio till after the middle of the eighteenth century. Then the picture changes. In 1756 we have the reliable price of £3/3/-; this is the equivalent of 105 loaves. In the decade of Johnson’s and Capell’s 1765 and 1767/68 editions of the plays and the publication of their recognition of the First Folio’s textual primacy, a Folio fetched the equivalent of 186 loaves (to the extent that the average price of five Folios is reliable). By the 1790s (when we have much more reliable figures and an average of eight Folio prices) the equivalent is nearly 900 loaves. Thus by the end of the eighteenth century the First Folio has moved into a different realm of value. Before leaving bread, however, let us compare its average values in two further decades: in the 1850s, a First Folio was worth 5,000 loaves and in the first decade of the twentieth century over 96,000 loaves. Accustomed as we are recently to hyper-inflation, it is salutary to remember that a loaf of bread cost exactly the same in pence in 1623, 1751 and 1907; (in 1850 a loaf was 25% above its 1623 price). Thus, until recent years, we can eliminate general inflation as a cause of the Folio’s rise in price. Rather, it results from such other forces as taste (for example, for collecting and for books), wealth, the spreading of wealth (ie, more buyers), liquidity of capital (as opposed to just land), spending patterns and the perception of the Folio as a desirable object.

The first price in the second time-span is the record £35/10/- famously bid in 1790 on behalf of the Duke of Roxburgh (who was present and spurred on the bidding). The terminus of the span is determined by another spectacular price leap--to the £716/2/- bid at the Daniel sale in 1864. Concerning this price Wheatley made the same point about autocorrelation as De Ricci and Lee above: it ‘had the effect of raising the price of all copies permanently’. Accordingly, the date of the previous sale--1862--ends the second time-span. In the period 1790-1862 we have enough market representative data to create charts and trend-lines: there are but two decades with less than seven prices; in one decade there are as many as twelve prices. Chart 2 plots for all First Folio sales the average price in each decade from the 1790s to the 1850s. (The figure for the 1850s is the average of prices from 1850 to 1862.) This chart and the charts which follow are placed at the end of the chapter after the appendixes. In this span there were two periods of growth, with an intermediary decline from the 1820s to the 1830s. The average annual growth rate from the 1790s to the 1820s, using the 1790s as a base, was 2.2%; from the 1830s to the 1850s, using the (low) average of the 1830s as a base, it was 12%. To put the price performance of the First Folio into perspective, the second line plots the British consumer price index (average for each decade) adjusted so that the average of the 1790s = 100. It shows what average

\footnote{Wheatley, 223, as already noted in Section E above.}

\footnote{The source of this series is 'Economics Brief: A Short History of Inflation', Economist, 22 February 1992, 88, which presents a chart of British consumer prices 1661-1991. I obtained from The...}
Folio prices would have been if they had performed in the same way as consumer prices. The Consumer Price Index (CPI) rose slightly to the 1810s, declined to the 1830s ('the deflation preceding the Corn Law controversies')²⁰⁷, then stayed pretty flat for the rest of the span, while the Folio price, apart from the decline in the 1830s which brought it back below the CPI, increased significantly to the end of the span.

Chart 3 plots the price of each individual First Folio sale from 1790 to 1862. Lee's Class I Folios (as homogenous a series as is possible) are shown with a square marker and his Class II-IV Folios with a round marker. A scatter diagram is used to give a picture of both the timing of sales and the levels of prices. The Class I prices are joined by a bold line; the Consumer Price Index is shown below by a thin line. Both lines are more bumpy than the lines in Chart 2, because the Folio data are for individual sales and the CPI data for individual years, not averages.²⁰⁸ The curve joining Class I Folios gives a visual impression of the premium paid for Folios in the best condition. It is noteworthy that the Class I curve joins, almost exclusively, the very top prices. In other words it suggests a market where buyers were already discriminating and were willing to pay top prices only for copies in perfect or good condition.

The first price in the third span, as indicated above, is the £716/2/- bid at the Daniel sale in 1864. The terminus of the span, using the same logic as before, is just before the spectacular leap in 1980 to £270,000. Chart 4 plots for all First Folio sales the average price in each decade from the 1860s to the 1970s. The consumer price index, taking 1864-69 as 100, shows what average Folio prices would have been if they had performed in the same way as consumer prices. For the first three decades in this span the Folio trundled along close to the CPI. In the 1890s, coincident with the rise in demand from the USA, its trend-line began to rise away, reaching a temporary ceiling in the 1930s. The average annual growth rate from the 1890s to the 1930s, using the average of the 1890s as a base, was 21%. Folio prices fell in the 1930s-40s, then began the skyrocketing rise to the zenith of the 1980s. The average annual growth rate

---

²⁰⁷ Carter, Taste and Technique in Book-Collecting, 5.
²⁰⁸ In fact, there are two reasons for the greater bumpiness, for the Chart 2 curves are 'smoothed', using the smoothing function built into Microsoft Excel software, Version 5.0a for Power Macintosh, and the Chart 3 curves are not smoothed. Further, the type of curve in the two charts is different: the curves in Chart 3 are two-period moving averages, used to reduce the amplitude of exceptional prices. Chart 2, being based on decade averages, did not need to use a moving average. Chart 4 is constructed in the same way as Chart 2; Chart 5 in the same way as Chart 3.

As noted in Appendix S/IP, Table N: (1) the high price for 1808 is for an unidentified copy; it could have been a Class I Folio and (2) the low price for 12 December 1828 is not definitely for Lee 8 and therefore not definitely for a Class I Folio.
contrast, from the 1950s to the heady 1980s, on the same base, it was around 430%.
However, taking into account the fact that the average price for the 1980s is distorted by
one particularly high price, that the average for the 1990s is based on only four prices,
and that prices in the 1990s (up to the present) have declined from the peak of the
1980s, one might feel that a better indicator of change would be from the base of the
1940s-50s to an average of the 1980s-90s: the average annual increase over these forty
years was 230%.

(1 A chart for 1864 to the present showing Class I Folio prices versus
Class II-IV prices—a parallel to Chart 3—is not given, in part because it would merely
tell the same story for this period as Chart 3 for the previous period, in part because
there are now many non-Lee volumes and these are not assigned to classes.)

As in the nineteenth century, at least from 1830, the ‘ring’ or ‘knockout’ operated
by booksellers would have affected prices. However, its effect on retail prices paid
was perhaps not enormous. Its impact more directly reduced the gains of book vendors
and increased the profits of the booksellers. The ring became illegal in Great Britain in
January 1928.209

Another way of looking at the Folio’s growth in value is to view the pattern of new
record prices. Table EE (derived from Tables G, N and X) shows these from 1787.

209 Anatomy of an Auction (117).
Table EE
New Record Prices of the First Folio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1787</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>c. 1900</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>9,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>10,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1808</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>14,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>121.8</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>26,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>76,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>269,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>716.1</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>388,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>411,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>691,040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the two centuries, a new record price was set on average every ten years. The longest lasting records were twenty-four years from 1864 (Lee 5, the Daniel copy) and twenty-seven years from 1933 (Lee 147, the Rosebery copy). Folger set the records in 1900, 1903 and 1922; the 1900 record seems to be the first set by an American. Since Folger, the buyers have been remarkably international: American in 1933 and 1989, German in 1960, Japanese in 1978 and 1985, French in 1980 and English in 1981. The buyers of these volumes may have been extravagant or lavish, but hardly wrong-headed or undiscriminating. All the copies in this table are in Lee’s Class I A or I B, or should have been, or have something special to recommend them. Lee 1/West 13, Lee 5/West 62, Lee 21/West 53 and Lee 147/West 192 each appear twice on the table. A comment of De Ricci’s helps to explain why Class I copies have consistently attracted both the very top prices as in Chart 3 and record prices as in the table above: ‘Since the end of the eighteenth century, the possession of a perfect copy has been the constant aim of every bibliophile’.

So far the only non-Folio indices used for comparison have been for the essentials of life. Table FF compares First Folio prices to the prices of three luxury items in the twentieth century—a Purdey shotgun, Russian caviar and a Jaguar motor car. Regarding homogeneity, there was probably little variation of quality between the early

---

210 This sum ‘was regarded as a fantastic extravagance’ (Lee, 1924, 98).
212 The data source for the luxury items is ‘Upmarket Philosophy’, Economist, 26 December 1992–8 January 1993, 91-94. The First Folio data are derived from Table X.
and later dates in the century for a Purdey or for Russian caviar; there was obviously considerable variation of quality between a 1930s and a 1990s Jaguar. The purchaser of these items would have certain characteristics in common with the purchaser of a First Folio—such as disposable wealth, aspects of lifestyle and taste, and perhaps the wish for 'the esteem and envy of fellow men'. For the luxury items, the base year is different in each case, while the year of comparison is the same (1992). For the First Folio: the base is the average price in the appropriate decade; for comparison, the average of the nine prices in the 1980s and 1990s is used, as being more representative than an average of the four prices in the 1990s.

| Table FF |
| Prices: First Folios Compared to Luxury Items in the Twentieth Century |
|---|---|---|---|
| Item | Year(s)/Price | Year(s)/Price | Price Multiple |
| Purdey Shotgun: top of the line | 1901: £89 | 1992: £25,250 | 184x |
| First Folio Decade 1900s: | £1,249 | Average 1980s-90s: | £270,266 | 216x |
| Russian Caviar: 2 ounces | 1912: £0.29 | 1992: £85 | 293x |
| First Folio Decade 1910s: | £1,428 | Average 1980s-90s: | £270,266 | 189x |
| Jaguar: most expensive two-seater | 1932: £310 | 1992: £48,385 | 156x |
| First Folio Decade 1930s: | £3,847 | Average 1980s-90s: | £270,266 | 70x |

The picture is mixed. The Folio outshoots the Purdey since the beginning of the century. Russian caviar outperforms the Folio though not by a great deal since the second decade. The price of the Jaguar accelerates at double the rate of that of the Folio

213 Ibid, 91, quoting Thorstein Veblen’s *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. The article further quotes Veblen: ‘In order to gain and hold the esteem of men, wealth must be put in evidence, for esteem is awarded only on evidence’ (92). A Folio provides the evidence. This is one sense in which it has something in common with a Purdey, Russian caviar and a Jaguar.
since the Depression—in part due to the fact that a 1992 Jaguar offered a lot more than a 1932.

A little closer to the Folio for comparing prices are works of art. The purchasers of Folios and of works of art are likely to have in common such defining characteristics as a fondness for unique and interesting or beautiful objects, a desire to collect or at least to own such objects, and perhaps some combination of intelligence, learning and acquisitiveness. Dealing with the art market, and taking the period 1760-1960, Gerald Reitlinger starts with the proposition that 'for a picture truly to have retained its standing over the past two hundred years, it must have multiplied its first price' many times. He has developed a set of figures for multiplying prices in eight successive base time-periods to arrive at putative prices in 1960 values. An object's success in retaining the value it had in the base period can be judged by comparing its 1960 market value with the 1960 putative value. Column 3 of Table GG gives the average price of First Folios in each of Reitlinger's base periods. (At least one of these periods—the fourth—is so long and embraces such a wide range of Folio prices that the average has little meaning, but refining the analysis by sub-dividing the period does not affect the overall conclusion.) Column 4 lists his multiples; he calls periods 2, 3, 5, 7 and 8 'fluid' and for each of these gives a range. Column 5 is simply column 3 times column 4. The figures in columns 3 and 5 are rounded.
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214 *The Economics of Taste*, 1, xii-xiii. Reitlinger actually says 'a hundred times over and more', rather than 'many times', but the latter is consistent with his multiples in column 4 of Table FF below.
Table GG
Putative Value of a First Folio in 1960
Using Reitlinger's Multiple

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Period</th>
<th>Average First Folio Price</th>
<th>Reitlinger's Multiple</th>
<th>Putative First Folio Price in 1960</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1760-1795</td>
<td>£18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>£216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1795-1815</td>
<td>£42</td>
<td>12 to 10</td>
<td>£500-420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1815-1850</td>
<td>£66</td>
<td>10 to 8</td>
<td>£660-530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1850-1914</td>
<td>£749</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>£4,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1914-1921</td>
<td>£1,930</td>
<td>6 to 3</td>
<td>£11,580-5,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1921-1939</td>
<td>£3,630</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>£13,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 1939-1948</td>
<td>£3,060</td>
<td>3.7 to 2</td>
<td>£11,320-6,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 1948-1960</td>
<td>£4,190</td>
<td>2 to 1</td>
<td>£8,380-4,190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The actual average prices of the First Folio in the 1950s and 1960s were £1,810 and £9,371 respectively. For the first three periods, even if we take the lower of these two figures, none of the putative prices tops it. In other words, starting in any of the first three base periods, the price of Folios advanced significantly more than the price of pictures. In periods 4 and 8, the putative prices are within the actual average price range of £1,810 to £9,371. This suggests that the advance in Folio prices and the advance in picture prices, starting in those two periods, were overall not all that different. In periods 5, 6 and 7, the low putative prices are well up within the range of £1,810 to £9,371, and the single and top putative prices are above the range. Starting in these periods, pictures seem to have done better. Thus, since the second half of the eighteenth century, if it were a question of investment, the issue would be which Folios or which pictures or in which year, rather than Folios versus pictures.

Perhaps the closest one can come to the First Folio for comparing prices is another esteemed book. The Gutenberg Bible is a century and three-quarters older, was incomparably better printed and is much rarer, but it is a book and it is comparably esteemed. Chart 5 plots individual prices for the Bible from 1793 to 1978 the first and last years for which I have prices (some years are approximate) against average prices by decade for the Folio. (To increase the homogeneity of the Bible series the prices of a vellum volume which sold five times in this period have been omitted.) A glance at Chart 5 shows that the growth pattern of the prices of the two books is broadly similar.
The slope for the First Folio would be steeper if a higher percentage had been used when it was sold in a package of the four Folios and it would again be steeper, from the sixties, if the high prices of the eighties were included.

It is fitting that a concluding comment concerning sales and prices should also embrace both books. It is because both books have been revered on this side idolatry (the Folio even though it is not rare) that each has created a price-class of its own. The price levels they have reached are such that both have virtually stopped trading. But if one had to decide whether high price or high reverence has done more to constrain buying and selling, the likely choice is high reverence. Leave aside that most institutions are not readily free to sell: most owners do not want to sell. ‘It is something to have one’ (ii, above).
SALES AND PRICES:
RESEARCH COVERAGE AND METHODS
FOR THE PERIOD 1676-1699

For the first quarter-century of English book auctions, from 1676 to 1700, I have made as exhaustive a search as is feasible. I have seen all readily accessible auction catalogues in Munby and Coral, *British Book Sale Catalogues* from the first English book auction up to the end of the century. Since the British Library has almost all of the catalogues in Munby and Coral, the search has covered most of the almost 400 they list up to 1700. Some gaps have been filled at the Bodleian. For example, Munby and Coral list some 138 catalogues for the years 1676 to 1688. Of these, the British Library has all but twenty-five. Of these twenty-five, I saw all but six at the Bodleian (and one of the six is exclusively of law books). I also sampled pre-1676 Continental catalogues on the unlikely chance that a First Folio would show up there, which it did not.

In contrast to later periods, my aim was to find all extant records of sales of the First Folio up to 1700. I am not entirely confident of having succeeded. First, a gap in my coverage is some catalogues not recorded in Munby and Coral. Second there is a risk of missing records due to the way the catalogues are organised. It is necessary to search under most headings including general ones like ‘Miscellanies in Folio’ and unlikely ones like ‘English books Divinity, History, Etc.’ Another trap involves books added at the end of a catalogue under ‘Books Omitted’, where a First Folio could be lurking. Further, within a subject and size category, the volumes are normally not alphabetised; when occasionally they are alphabetised within a category, they may not be alphabetised within a letter, ie, Shakespeare could appear anywhere under ‘S’. Moreover, the way the catalogues are preserved adds to the risk of missing records. The volumes or microfilms are often not organised by date, or by English-language-only, and sometimes they contain items other than books. In a given volume or microfilm, one might find a mix of catalogues in the 1600s and 1700s, English and foreign, books-only and occasionally non-book. However, the danger of missing a Folio reference was partly offset by viewing some catalogues twice or even three times. This happened because, when I had a given volume or microfilm out to see a particular catalogue, I tended also to look at the other catalogues it contained (the British Library has more than one copy of many of the catalogues), and because the Bodleian catalogues often duplicate those of the British Library.
Appendix S/P 2

SALES AND PRICES OF
THE SECOND, THIRD AND FOURTH FOLIOS
1676-1699

This appendix contains data on sales by auction of the Second, Third and Fourth Folios
in the period 1676 to 1699. The primary sources are the original auction catalogues in
the British and Bodleian libraries. The source catalogue for many of the sales is readily
traced, through its date, in Munby and Coral, which gives library shelf-marks; some of
the sales are not recorded in Munby and Coral. Where appropriate, I give additional
identifying information. Volumes listed in the same catalogue and sold on the same
date appear in the table in the same row. An entry in a row not divided into columns
indicates that the source does not give information for determining the edition. The first
item for the Third Folio is the date of the imprint—i.e., 1663 or 1664.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales of the Second, Third and Fourth Folios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676-1699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Folio</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 May 1678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1/8/6216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Apr 1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Nov 1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664: 2 May 1684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664: No sale date,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perhaps 1684?220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

216 Lawler incorrectly says ‘8s. 6d.’ (119). The British Library shelf-mark for the volume containing
the manuscript prices for the 13 May 1678 sale is C.120.c.2.(5).
217 This sale included part of the library of Sir Kenelm Digby. Lot 172 was ‘Shakespear’s (Will)
Comedies, Histories and Tragedies 1632’, but it is not clear that this was Digby’s copy. The catalogue
is priced in manuscript (BL, 11906.e.13).
218 The source of the price is Lawler, 143.
219 The source of the price is Wheatley, 232.
220 This is lot 597 in an undated catalogue on the title-page of which someone has written ‘Christopher
Bateman’, an auctioneer who appears to have traded mainly in the years 1695 to 1731. Though the
order of the catalogues in the volume in which they are bound could be modern, this catalogue follows
a catalogue of 3 November 1684 and is followed first by a catalogue of 30 November 1702 and second
by the 2 May 1684 catalogue (see the line above) containing the Third Folio. (These are definitely two
different Third Folios since they have different lot numbers, the one priced at 15/6 being lot 99.) (BL,
microfilm SC 920-23.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 Sep 1685</td>
<td>3 Nov 1685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Apr 1686</td>
<td>15/- <strong>221</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Apr 1686</td>
<td>18/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Oct 1686</td>
<td>16/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Feb 1687</td>
<td>9 May 1687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Mar 1687</td>
<td>Lot 62 under 'Divinity, History, etc in Folio', 'Shakespears Plays', (nd) (BL, SC 1036).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Jun 1687</td>
<td>12 July 1687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 July 1687</td>
<td>21 Nov 1687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Jan 1688</td>
<td>13 Feb 1688, lot 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Jan 1688</td>
<td>13 Feb 1688, lot 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Apr 1688 (Source: Lawler, 104)</td>
<td>6 Aug 1688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Oct 1689</td>
<td>16 Dec 1689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Oct 1689</td>
<td>9 Feb 1691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Jul no year</td>
<td>Lot 4, 'Shakesp'ar's Plays', (nd) (BL, 821.i.15).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Feb no year; placed here because it follows the previous catalogue in the volume.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664: 23 Feb 1691</td>
<td>1664: Lot 56<strong>224</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1663: Lot 50<strong>225</strong></td>
<td>19 Oct 1691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Jan 1692<strong>227</strong></td>
<td>1 June 1692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963: 5 Apr 1694</td>
<td>2 May 1694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**221** The two prices for this sale and the one for 4 October 1686 are from the handwritten notes in the catalogues for the Richard Davis sales (BL, 821.i.11).

**222** This was a sale of 'English books of Mr Charles Meame's late Bookseller to His Majesty'. Charles Meame succeeded his father, Samuel, as 'Royal Bookbinder, Bookseller, and Stationer' until his death in 1686, and was succeeded by this elder brother, Samuel, as Royal Bookbinder (Howard M Nixon and Mirjam M Foot, *The History of Decorated Bookbinding in England* (Oxford, 1992), 63).

**223** The catalogue gives the publication date as 1684; there is no question but this is a Fourth Folio since the catalogue states '4th Edition'.

**224** The catalogue has no title-page but follows a run of thirty-two catalogues in date sequence starting 27 April 1691 and ending 7 March 1692 (BL, 821.i.9).

**225** The catalogue has no title-page, but follows the previous catalogue. Lot 54 is 'Shakesp'ar's plays last edition'. It has to be a Fourth Folio because there is another book in the catalogue published in 1686.

**226** The catalogue has no title-page, but follows the previous catalogue.

**227** Same sale as in previous row: under 'English Miscellany, etc in Folio', 'Shakesp'ar's plays last edition.'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 Feb 1695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Feb 1695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1663: 15 Apr 1695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1663: 11 Jun 1695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Nov [1695]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Feb [1696]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Aug 1697: 'Best edition', therefore ? F4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Oct 1697</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664: 4 May 1698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664: [No day/month] 1699 (BL, SC 921)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday the 16th [1699?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SELECTED AUTHORS FROM THE SALES OF RICHARD DAVIS’S STOCK 1686-1688

The prices for the works of ten literary figures from the first three sales of Richard Davis’s stock (the fourth had no English books) provide a rich context for viewing Folio prices. The catalogues can be traced through Munby and Coral on the following dates: 19 April and 4 October 1686, and 25 June 1688; they are all in the BL volume with the shelf-mark 821.i.11. The entries appear in the catalogues under variations of ‘English Miscellanies in Folio’. Except for the last two, they are arranged in the table below by author in alphabetical order; within each author, the entries appear in the same order as the catalogues. Columns 1 and 2 are quoted from the catalogue’s printed text, column 4 from the hand-written additions. Column 3 gives the sale number and catalogue page reference; the first catalogue has an addendum: ‘English Folio’, which is not paginated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot No.</th>
<th>Author and Book</th>
<th>Sale/Page No.</th>
<th>Price s./d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>588</td>
<td>Beaumont and Fletcher’s 50 Comedies and Tragedies (best Edit.) [1676]</td>
<td>1/158</td>
<td>17/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Fr. Beaumonts and Jo. Fletchers fifty Comedies and Tragedies Lond. 1672</td>
<td>1/add</td>
<td>15/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Beaumont and Fletcher’s fifty Comedies and Tragedies [London] 1679</td>
<td>2/105</td>
<td>17/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Sir Geo. Chaucers Works. Lond. 1542</td>
<td>1/107</td>
<td>10/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Chaucer (Sir Geo.) Works, wants a Title</td>
<td>2/107</td>
<td>2/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Cowley (Abra.) Works of Poetry, etc. complete [London] 1681</td>
<td>1/148</td>
<td>13/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Abra. Cowleys Workes compleat Lond. 1681</td>
<td>1/add</td>
<td>14/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Cowley (Abr.) Works of Poetry, etc. complete</td>
<td>2/106</td>
<td>12/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>Works, Poems, etc., Complete, by Abraham Cowley [London] 1684</td>
<td>2/115</td>
<td>11/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Cowley’s (Ab.) Works compleat, First and Second Vol. 1684</td>
<td>3/73</td>
<td>11/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Cowley’s (Ab.) Works Compleat, First and Second Vol. 1684</td>
<td>3/75</td>
<td>10/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Abr. Cowley’s Works second part Lond. 1684</td>
<td>3/76</td>
<td>2/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Cowley’s Works compleat, viz. First and Second Parts 1681</td>
<td>3/76</td>
<td>10/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Abr. Cowley’s Works first and second Parts in 1 vol. 1681</td>
<td>3/77</td>
<td>12/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Abr Cowley’s Works of Poetry, etc. complete 1684</td>
<td>3/78</td>
<td>11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Edition/Price</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>D'Avenant (Sir W.) Works [London] 1673</td>
<td>1/149 16/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Sir William Davenants Works, viz. Poems, Plays, etc. London 1673</td>
<td>1/add 12/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Davenant (Sir Wm.) Works, Poems, Plays, etc. [London] 1673</td>
<td>2/107 13/-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493</td>
<td>Works, Poems, Plays, etc. of Sir William D'avenant [London] 1673</td>
<td>2/115 15/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Donne (Dean) Fifty Sermons, second Vol. [London] 1649</td>
<td>2/107 4/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Hobbes (Tho.) Leviathan [London] 1651</td>
<td>1/150 14/-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>M. Tho. Hobbs Leviathan Lond. 1651</td>
<td>1/add 10/-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Holinshed (Rap.) Chronicle of England, Scotland, etc. 1st. and 2nd. Vol. [London] 1586</td>
<td>1/150 15/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Ben. Johnson’s Works, being Playes, Masques, etc. 2d Vol. [London] 1640</td>
<td>1/153 5/0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Johnson (Ben.) Works, being Playes, Masques, etc. 2d Vol. large Paper gilt [London] 1640</td>
<td>2/111 7/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>Killigrew (W.) Four Playes, Siege of Urbin, Selindra, etc. Oxford 1666</td>
<td>1/154 2/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Killigrew (Sir Wm.) Four Playes, Siege of Urbin, Selindra, etc [London] 1666</td>
<td>2/111 2/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Killigrew (Sir William) Four Playes, Siege of Urbin, Selindra, etc. 1666</td>
<td>3/74 2/-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>Philips (Kath.) Poems, etc. [London] 1678</td>
<td>1/155 6/-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>Philip’s (Kath.) Poems, etc. [London] 1678</td>
<td>2/113 4/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Philip’s (Kath.) Poems, etc. 1678</td>
<td>3/75 5/-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Kath. Phillip’s Poems and Plays Lond. 1678</td>
<td>3/79 5/-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Phillips (Kath.) Poems and Plays Lond. 1678</td>
<td>3/149 4/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Countess of Pembrooks Arcadia by Sir Phil. Sydney Lond. 1674</td>
<td>1/add 8/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>Sidney (Sr. Philip) Pembroke’s Arcadia, A Pastoral Romance [London] 1674</td>
<td>2/114 9/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Sidney (Sir Philip) Pembroke’s Arcadia, a Pastoral Romance 1633</td>
<td>3/73 4/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Sir Philip Sidney’s Pembrokes Arcadia a Pastoral Romance 1674</td>
<td>3/79 7/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Sidney (Sir Ph.) Pembroke’s Arcadia, a Pastoral Romance [London] 1674</td>
<td>3/149 8/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Brooke (Ralph) Heraldry, etc [London] 1622</td>
<td>1/148 4/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Favine’s (Andr.) Theater of Honour and Knighthood 1623</td>
<td>1/150 7/-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SALES AND PRICES:
RESEARCH COVERAGE AND METHODS
FOR THE PERIOD 1700-1799

My aim was to search a large enough sample of eighteenth-century catalogues to get a reasonably full and accurate (though not complete) picture of First Folio sales and prices (Appendix S/P 5). Data for the other three Folios (Appendix S/P 6) were gathered from the catalogues consulted for the First Folio.

The information is from both auction catalogues and booksellers’ retail catalogues. Munby and Coral list both without distinguishing them. As they state in their Introduction (xvii-xviii), they do not list ‘trade sale’ catalogues, that is for auctions, conducted throughout the period, open only to members of the trade. Though prices at trade sales would have directly affected prices set by booksellers, they would have been only one influence on prices actually paid in the different marketplace of (booksellers’ and auction) retail sales. With my focus on retail sales, and to maintain comparability in price comparisons, I have not incorporated trade sales in my analysis.

My approach was as follows:

• To search all the catalogues in the British Library listed in Munby and Coral for the decennial years 1710 to 1790. The purpose was to see if any trends were discernible in these decennial soundings. As it happened not enough records turned up to make valid generalisations possible.

• To increase the sample, to search all the catalogues in the same volume or microfilm as the catalogues in decennial years.

• To search all Sotheby’s Sales Catalogues in the British Library from 1739, when they began, to 1790. These are marked up by the auctioneer and provide a valuable record of both prices and buyers.

• To search the catalogues of notable, especially large, sales, and the catalogues of notable people, especially writers.

To the data found in the foregoing I added records mentioned in Lee, Census; Harold Otness and others. I did not search catalogue volumes or microfilms after 1790 beyond those selected by the foregoing approach, since this uncovered enough records in the 1790s for the purpose of getting a reasonably full and accurate picture.

---

Looking at all the Sotheby's catalogues did not result in my seeing a greater proportion of available catalogues in the second half of the century. In fact, I searched nearly twice as many catalogues in the first half as in the second. For the century as a whole I saw about one third of those listed in Munby and Coral.

There is one trap worth mentioning. A book listed in a bookseller's catalogue may turn up, if unsold, in a subsequent catalogue and there is the danger of counting the same volume more than once. If the same title and date of publication turn up with the same description and the same price in the subsequent catalogue(s) of the same bookseller, it seems more than likely that it is the same volume. However, there is usually no description at all, or at least no description that is distinctive, so that one cannot tell whether the same title and publication date in a subsequent catalogue, perhaps with a different price, refers to the same volume or not. While I have tried to avoid double-counting, I may not have been completely successful. An interesting example involving three volumes and a succession of nine catalogues of the same bookseller occurs with the two Second Folios and one Fourth Folio first offered in the 24 July 1758 catalogue of Thomas Payne. Table F below illustrates how these three volumes were successively offered. The description of the 'interleaved' Second Folio is exceptionally distinctive.
Table F

Extracts from Thomas Payne's Catalogues 1758-1762

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 Jul 1758</td>
<td>'Shakespeare's Works, 2d edition, interleaved, in 3 vols. in boards ... 1632'</td>
<td>£1/11/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'The same Book, 2nd edit. ... 1632'</td>
<td>£1/1/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'The same, 4th edit. very fair copy, and neatly bound ... 1688 [sic]'</td>
<td>15/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Feb 1759</td>
<td>Same description and price for each volume, with the date of the last volume corrected to 1685</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Aug 1759</td>
<td>'Shakespeare's Works, 2d Edit. interleav'd, in 3 vols. in boards ... 1632'</td>
<td>£1/7/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'The same Book bound in 1 vol. ... 1632'</td>
<td>£1/1/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'The same Book, very neatly bound ... 1685'</td>
<td>15/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Feb 1760</td>
<td>Virtually the same wording as in the previous catalogue for each volume</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Jul 1760</td>
<td>As in previous catalogue</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Jan 1761</td>
<td>'Shakespear's Works, 2d. edit. very fair ... 1632'</td>
<td>£1/1/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The other 2 volumes not mentioned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Oct 1761</td>
<td>'Shakespeare's Works, 3 vol. 2d. edition, interleaved, in boards ... 1632'</td>
<td>£1/1/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The other 2 volumes not mentioned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 May 1762</td>
<td>Virtually the same words. No change in price</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Jun 1762</td>
<td>No mention of any of the three volumes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to note that Payne reduced the price of the 'interleaved' Second Folio from £1/11/6, first to £1/7/- (6 August 1759), then to £1/1/- (28 January 1761). I have used the last price, as the market obviously did not bear the previous two. It is also interesting to note that the copy of the First Folio now at Queen's College, Oxford, was in Thomas Payne's shop during the period covered by the above entries. Presumably it did not make its way into the catalogue because, as Lee says in the Census (copy 64), Garrick bought it from Payne c. 1760.
Appendix S/P 5

SALES AND PRICES OF THE FIRST FOLIO
1700-1799

This appendix contains details of the sales and several offers of the First Folio in the eighteenth century. Unless otherwise noted (e.g., Lee, Census), the sources are auction and booksellers' catalogues. The source catalogue can be traced, through its date, in Munby and Coral, which gives shelf-marks. Words and figures underlined in Table G are added in manuscript in the original printed catalogue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sales and Prices of the First Folio</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1700-1799</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| c. 1700 | 1. Lee, *Census*, copy 88, the Major-General Frederick Edward Sotheby copy: ‘probably purchased by present owner’s ancestor, James Sotheby, c. 1700, for £1 6s. Condition [in 1902]: good; fly-leaf and another leaf supplied in facsimile.’ I have not located this copy. |
| 1734 | 3. ‘A Catalogue of the Libraries of Edward Dupper, Esq., Late Secretary to the Commissioners of Bankrupts: and of Mr. Cecil Clay, Both deceased . . . which will begin to be Sold Cheap (the Price mark’d in each Book) at Dan. Browne’s, at the Black-Swan without Temple-Bar, on Wednesday the 6th of February, 1733-4.’ Under ‘English History, Miscellanies, Voyages, Travels, Etc., Folio’: Item 146 ‘Shakespear’s Works, 1st Edit. 1623’. |
| 1740 | 4. and 5. ‘A New Catalogue of Books . . . Catalogues (the Prices printed very cheap) to be had at A. Jackson’s Shop in Clare-Court, Drury-Lane, where the sale begins May 2d. 1740.’ Item 20 ‘ditto [following the Second Folio] 1st edit. wants Title. 15s. [nd]’. Item 21 ‘ditto imperfect. 8s [nd]’. |

*This is the first bookseller’s retail catalogue, as opposed to auction catalogue, in which I have found a First Folio.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>6. Lee, in his <em>Census</em> Introduction (8), says that 'In a London sale-catalogue of 1748, the earliest that has yet been found definitely to mention a First Folio, the volume was described as &quot;a fine copy, very scarce&quot;.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>7. Otness (73) cites a First Folio sale in 1750 for £10, but gives no source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756</td>
<td>8. 'A Catalogue of the . . . Library of Martin Folkes, Esq. President of the Royal Society . . . Lately Deceased . . . will be sold by auction by Samuel Baker . . . To begin on Monday, February 2, 1756. [On the] Eighteenth Day's Sale. Saturday, Feb. 21, 1756 [Under] Folio [Lot] 2307 Shakespeare's Plays, 1623 3-3 Dr Monroe.' Lee, <em>Census</em>, for copy 48, the Folkes volume, says, citing no source, 'said to have been owned c. 1730 by Lewis Theobald'. It was bought at the 1756 Folkes sale by George Steevens and is now in the John Rylands University of Manchester Library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1760</td>
<td>9. Lee, <em>Census</em>, copy 45 (now in the British Library): 'Purchased c. 1760 by Clayton Mordaunt Cracherode, apparently for £8 18s. 6d.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1760</td>
<td>10. Lee, <em>Census</em>, copy 64 (now at Queen's College, Oxford): 'acquired by David Garrick c. 1760 of Thomas Payne, the London bookseller, for £1 16s.'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1765 11. 'A Catalogue of . . . the Library of . . . Dr. Joseph Letherland, Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, Lately deceased; Which will be sold by Auction, by Samuel Baker . . . March the 14th 1765, and to continue the Twenty-one following Evenings.' ‘Eighteenth Day’s Sale, Tuesday, April 9, 1765.’ Under ‘Folio’: Lot 2886 ‘The same Book [after a Second Folio], 1st Edit. 4to. with Othello 1623 6/7/6 Bathoes [the purchaser].’ My interpretation is that ‘4to with Othello’ is parenthetical and that a Quarto Othello was sold along with the Folio. This is the first First Folio I have found in a catalogue which also offered the other three folios.

1765 12. ‘A Catalogue of the Libraries Of the Honourable and Reverend Edward Townshend, D.D. Dean of Norwich; And of the Honourable Horatio Townshend, Both lately Deceased . . . Which will be sold by Auction, by Samuel Baker . . . Monday, May the 13th, 1765, and to continue the four following days.’ (The sale also included books of Joseph Letherland—see previous entry.) ‘Third Day’s Sale, Wednesday, May 15, 1765.’ Under ‘Folio’: Lot 534 ‘Shakespear’s Works, first edit. 1623 5/10/- Moran [or ? Moxan. The purchaser’s name is crossed through].’


1772 14. Lee 1906, 20, says for his newly discovered copy number IV: ‘A note on the fly-leaf records that the volume was purchased in 1772 for five guineas.’ Otness (73) cites a sale in 1770 for five guineas, but gives no source; I have assumed he was referring to this 1772 sale. This copy is now in the Dallas Public Library.

230 Lee, Census, Introduction, 8, says ‘In 1766, [three guineas] was realized at the sale of the library of the well-known author, David Mallet.’ I could find no Shakespeare Folio in the catalogue for Mallet’s sale, 10 March 1766, reproduced in Munby, 7. Lee was perhaps mistakenly referring to a lot added in MS after lot 745: ‘Shakespeare’s Plays Quarto’, which fetched three guineas.
1781


1781

16. 7 September 1781. William Sheldon: ‘Books and manuscripts. Christie & Ansell, sold on Sheldon’s premises, Weston near Long Compton in County Warwick. Book section, 27 August sale’ (Munby and Coral, 78). The ‘auctioneer’s—Heber-Phillips—copy’ of the catalogue for this sale, lacking its title-page, in Cambridge University Library, has: ‘[lot] 523 Shakespeare’s Works, first edition, 1623. Milton’s Paradise Lost, and 1 more. £2/4/- Vang’. Lee, Census, copy 20, incorrectly says the copy was purchased by ‘Mr. King’. A letter from the University Library states: ‘I take the buyer’s name to be “Vang”; there is a note in the front of the book by Heber which suggests that this is probably Vandenberg, a London bookseller. There is not specific mention of the First Folio in Heber’s notes’. This copy is now Folger 10.

1785

17. ‘A Catalogue of the valuable Library of Books, Of the late learned Samuel Johnson, Esq; LL.D. Deceased; which will be sold by Auction . . . by Mr. Christie . . . on Wednesday, February 16, 1785, and the three following days.’ Lot 467 ‘Shakespeare’s comedies, histories and tragedies 1623’.

---

231 Nicolas Smith, Under-Librarian, Rare Books Department, Cambridge University Library, letter, 14 April 1998, enclosing a photocopy of the entry relating to the First Folio.

232 There are some anomalies concerning Johnson’s ownership of Folios. On the evidence of George Steevens he definitely owned a First Folio: writing to Isaac Reed in 1790, he speaks of the leaves ‘blotted, greased, or scribbled on, by Dr Johnson’ in a First Folio he, Steevens, owned. (The reference for this letter is given above in a footnote to the text.) Lee, Census, says (a) Johnson owned Lee 55 (p 28), now in the British Library, (b) Johnson ‘owned another copy at his death’ (p 28), and (c) ‘positive traces are unfortunately lost of the [First Folio] sold at Dr. Johnson’s sale, in 1785’ (p 14). Regarding (a), a leaf in Lee 55, which has a manuscript note saying ‘It belonged to Mr. Theobald. From him it devolved to Dr Johnson’, also has a manuscript note which says ‘This advertisement leaf belongs to the 2nd folio and has been tipped into this copy at some time’. Regarding (b) and (c), these references are presumably to the same copy. From the foregoing one could conclude that Johnson did not own Lee 55 and that the copy owned ‘at his death’ was the one sold in 1785. However, J D Fleeman, A Preliminary Handlist of Copies of Books Associated with Dr. Samuel Johnson, Oxford Bibliographical Society Occasional Publication, 17 (1984), lists only one Folio—a Second (item 245). His notes for this Second Folio include: ‘Christie’s (Johnson), 16 Feb. 1785, 467 (“1623”). The ’1623’ presumably indicates it is misdated in the catalogue. Finally, Fleeman does not list the Third Folio, lot 353, in the 1785 Johnson sale.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Catalogue Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>'A Catalogue of the Library of John Henderson, Esq; (Late of Covent Garden Theatre,) Deceased . . . which will be sold by T. and J. Egerton, Booksellers, At their Room, in Scotland Yard . . . on Monday, the 20th of February, 1786 and the Five following days.' 'Sixth Day, Saturday, Feb. 25, 1786. [Lot] 970 Shakespeare (Will.) Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies, published according to the true Original Copies, imperf. folio, printed for J. [sic] Jaggard and E. Blount 1623 19/-.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1787</td>
<td>'A Catalogue of the Library of Richard Wright, M.D., Fellow of the Royal Society, (Deceased.) . . . which will be sold by Auction by T. and J. Egerton, Booksellers; at their room, in Scotland Yard . . . On Monday, April 23d, 1787; and the Eleven following Days.' The heading before the eighth day's sale is 'The English Theatre'. 'Ninth Day. Wednesday, May 2d. . . . [lot] 1960 Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories and Tragedies, first folio edition, bound in Russia leather with gilt leaves 1623 10/0/-.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>'A Catalogue of the Genuine Library of John Watson Reed, Esq. F.S.A. Late of Ely-Place, deceased . . . which will be sold by auction by J. Egerton, Bookseller, at the Room in Scotland Yard on Monday March 1st, 1790, And the following Day.' Under 'Folio': '[Lot] 400 Shakespeare's Works, published by Heminge and Condell, first edition, a very fine Copy, bound in Morocco, with gilt leaves 1623.' This is Lee 21, now at the Huntington. At the 1790 sale, 'it was purchased by the great book-collector, the third Duke of Roxburghe, for £35 14s.' (Lee, Census for copy 21).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>21. In the 5 October 1790 letter to Isaac Reed, referred to at '1765?' above, George Steevens wrote: 'I am in treaty with Mr Edwards of Pall-mall for a first Folio, which he is soon to receive. Provided it answers his description, he thinks he shall do me a favour by letting me have it at the small charge of twenty guineas.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790?</td>
<td>22. 'A Catalogue of Books . . . now [1790?] selling . . . by Henry Chapman, Bookseller, No. 65, Chandois-Street, Covent Garden.' Under 'Miscellaneous, Poetry, and Translations. Folio.': '[Item] 873 Shakespeare's Plays, the first edit. bound in 2 vols. imperfect, 1L 5s [nd]'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790?</td>
<td>23. Item 874 'The same, first edit. imperfect, but contains 20 plays perfect, 10s 6d [nd]'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td>24. Lee, <em>Census</em> Introduction, 8, quoting Beloe, says &quot;'a superb copy,' . . . realized thirteen [guineas] at Dr. Monro's sale in 1792 (this apparently became afterwards the Grenville copy'). The Grenville copy is now in the British Library. I found no entry for this volume in the sale catalogue of John Monroe's library sold over fifteen days at Sotheby's from 23 April 1792. I make the assumption that Beloe was correct about the thirteen guinea price and that Lee misstated where the sale occurred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1792</td>
<td>25. Lee, <em>Census</em>, copy 9, says 'purchased c 1792 by Henry Constantine Jennings, a well-known collector (1731-1819 [DNB]), for 70 guineas of Thomas Payne, the bookseller.' This copy is now in the Elizabethan Club Library, Yale University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>26. 'A Catalogue of the . . . very valuable library of Thomas Allen, Esq. which will be sold by auction, by Leigh and Sotheby, booksellers, at their House in York-Street, Covent-Garden. On Monday, June 1, 1795, and the nine following days.' '[Lot] 1401 Shakespeare's Plays, First Edition, blue turkey, gilt leaves—1623 (£)18/18/-'. The buyer was 'St John'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1798</td>
<td>27. 'A Catalogue of the Extensive Library of the late Revd. Richard Farmer, D. D. Canon Residentiary of St. Paul's, Master of Emmanuel College, Librarian to the University of Cambridge, and Fellow of the Royal and Antiquary Societies. . . which will be sold by Auction by Mr. King . . . on Monday, May 7, 1798, And the Thirty-five following Days.' Lot 7829 'Shakespeare's Works, 1st edition, in folio, wants title; last leaf from the 4to [sic]. 1623 7/-/-'. Lee in his <em>Census</em> Introduction says that Farmer's copy was bought '(in a somewhat dilapidated state) [by] Thomas Amyot for £7 in 1798' (14) and that the volume sold in 1840 by Bishop Samuel Butler was 'acquired c 1830, apparently of Thomas Amyot' (15).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

233 Otness (73) says that Edwards(Seller/Dealer) sold a copy in 1796 for '£3, 30s' (sic). As he gives no source and the '£3/30s' is nonsense, I ignore this record. He could be referring to J Edward's catalogue, 1796, item 792, an offer for a Second Folio for £3/3/-.
Appendix S/P 6

SALES AND PRICES OF
THE SECOND, THIRD AND FOURTH FOLIOS
1700-1799

This appendix contains data on sales and offers of the Second, Third and Fourth Folios during the eighteenth century. The source catalogue can usually be traced, through the date, in Munby and Coral, which gives shelf-marks. Where needed, I give additional identifying information. Volumes listed in the same row are from the same catalogue. The first item for the Third Folio is the date of the imprint—ie, 1663 or 1664—when given. Words and figures underlined in Table H are added in manuscript in the original printed catalogue.

Table H

Sales and Prices of the Second, Third and Fourth Folios
1700-1799

Where it seems clear, details of volumes in booksellers' catalogues, as opposed to auction catalogues, are distinguished by being in *italics*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Folio</th>
<th>Third Folio with date of imprint</th>
<th>Fourth Folio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 Jan 1709</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 Feb 1702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1664: 28 Nov 1709</td>
<td>1664: 21 Nov 1727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Aug 1719</td>
<td>Nicholas Rowe's copy</td>
<td>13 Feb 1722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Aug 1720</td>
<td>'Shakespear's Plays (wants Title) [nd]'</td>
<td>13 Feb 1722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Jun 1726</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 Mar 1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Dec 1730</td>
<td>'Shakespear's Plays, genuine Edition [nd]'</td>
<td>12 Apr 1731</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²³⁴ The catalogues of 2 May 1740, 14 March 1765, July 1781, 20 February 1786, 23 April 1787, 1 March 1790, and 7 May 1798 also contained a First Folio.

²³⁵ The copy of Sir Constantin Huygens. The possibility of his owning a First Folio is discussed in Chapter 4, Section B, 'Following the Trails of Elusive Copies'.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Apr 1739</td>
<td>£1/7/6 'best Edit, and a fine Copy'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 May 1739</td>
<td>£1-5/- at T Osborne’s shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Nov 1739</td>
<td>£1-5/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Dec 1739</td>
<td>£1-5/- Library of Capt Winde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Dec 1739</td>
<td>£1-5/- Libraries of Dr Edmund Halley and another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Jan 1740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 May 1740</td>
<td>£1-5/- 'Wants Cinbeline'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Oct 1740</td>
<td>Library of Capt Winde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 May 1742</td>
<td>Libraries of Dr Edmund Halley and another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Nov 1754</td>
<td>£1-5/- 'Shakespear’s Works, 3d Edit [nd]’ (SC 375)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Apr 1755</td>
<td>£2/12/6 Library of Richard Mead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 July 1760</td>
<td>£1/1/- 'Very neatly bound'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Jan 1761</td>
<td>£1/1/- 'very fair, imperfect in last leaf'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Nov 1761</td>
<td>£1/1/- '3 vol. 2d edition, interleaved in boards'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 May 1762</td>
<td>£1/1/- '3 vol. 2d edition, interleaved in boards'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 Jan 1732

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 Oct 1739</td>
<td>£1-5/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Jan 1738</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Apr 1739</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Jan 1732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

256 I have assumed that this Folio in the catalogue of the bookseller T Osborne is the same as the one which appears in his catalogues of 14 November 1737, 10 May and 27 November 1738, and 26 February and 24 May 1739.

257 The Fourth Folio price in each of the catalogues of 16 October, 6 November and 12 December 1739 is £1/5/-, but the catalogues are of different booksellers. No doubt they watched each others’ prices competitively. The Fourth Folio offered on 3 April 1739 for £1/7/6 by Samuel Baker seems not to have sold over a year later, for a Fourth Folio appeared with the same description and the same price in his catalogue of 6 May 1740.

258 Date of publication given: ‘1686’. Presumed to be a Fourth Folio.

259 As there were two libraries sold, this was not necessarily Halley’s volume (Munby, XI, 161).

260 The Fourth Folios cited on 21 January, 11 March, and 31 October 1740 are in successive catalogues of one book dealer, C Cock. He gives a different source library in each catalogue. While dealers tended to do this even when some volumes were not from the named library, but from old stock, I have counted these as different volumes.

261 A Fourth Folio with the same description appeared in the 14 August 1759 and 22 January 1760 catalogues of the same booksellers—John Whiston and Benjamin White—priced at 18/-. I have assumed that it is the same volume and that they reduced the price.

262 Given as '[Lot] 39 Shakespear’s Tragedies 1632'.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lot Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Buyer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 Mar 1765&lt;sup&gt;243&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Lot 2885</td>
<td>£1/4/- Buyer = White &amp; Co (SCS 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Mar 1767</td>
<td>Lot 2884</td>
<td>£1/3/- (No buyer given)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Mar 1765</td>
<td>Lot 2883</td>
<td>£1/2/- Buyer = Stevens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664: 13 Feb 1770</td>
<td></td>
<td>'1663 [sic]: Mar 1770 'Shakespeare's Works' (Lockyer Davis, 128.k.3) £1/1/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664: 'This day 1770' (Thomas Payne, 128.k.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1/1/- 'This day 1770' 'Best edition, neat' (Richard Dymott, 128.k.4) 18/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Feb 1777&lt;sup&gt;244&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>'bound in Morocco leather, gilt leaves' £5/10/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Mar 1777</td>
<td>Lot 128.1</td>
<td>£18/6 Buyer = J White (SCS 11, p 23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 May 1778</td>
<td></td>
<td>'very fair' 10/6 Buyer = Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Jul 1778</td>
<td>'2d edit.'</td>
<td>'2d edition, wants title and latter end [nd]' 1/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Jul 1778</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/6 Buyer = T Payne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1781</td>
<td>'Very fair'</td>
<td>£1/11/6 'Very fair'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 1782</td>
<td>'Eleg. bound in Russia'</td>
<td>£2/11&lt;sup&gt;245&lt;/sup&gt; 'Eleg. bound in Russia'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Apr 1782</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/6 Buyer = Dennis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Nov 1783</td>
<td>£1/1/-</td>
<td>'2d edition, with head'. £1/3/- Buyer = Hill (SCS 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Feb 1786</td>
<td>£1/2/-</td>
<td>Samuel Johnson's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>243</sup> These three lots, together with a First Folio, are from the Library of Dr Joseph Letherland.

<sup>244</sup> This is Charles I's Folio, with his MS motto 'Dum Spiro Spero, C. R.', in the sale of Anthony Askew's library.

<sup>245</sup> The catalogues of July 1781, with a First and Second Folio, and February 1782, with two Second and one Fourth Folio, are both Thomas Payne's. I have assumed that the other Second Folio in the 1782 catalogue is the same volume as in the 1781 catalogue. In both catalogues it has the same description and price.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lot No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 Feb 1786</td>
<td>Lot 971</td>
<td>£1/6/- 'imperfect'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 972</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 973</td>
<td></td>
<td>15/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 974</td>
<td></td>
<td>8/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 975</td>
<td>'Works, fol. imperf.' [nd]</td>
<td>11/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Apr 1787</td>
<td>Lot 1663</td>
<td>£2/9/- 'bound in Russia'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1664</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1/8/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1961</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1/1/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1962</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1964</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following six volumes are in Benjamin White’s catalogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lot No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 Jan 1790</td>
<td>Lot 1795</td>
<td>'With portrait, neat'</td>
<td>7/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1796</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1799</td>
<td>'Very neat'</td>
<td>£1/16/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mar 1790</td>
<td>Lot 401</td>
<td>'bound in Morocco, with gilt leaves'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1791</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 May 1795</td>
<td>Lot 7830</td>
<td>'part of ditto, containing 12 plays'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 7831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 7832</td>
<td></td>
<td>£2/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 7833</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The source for these two 1795 sales and prices is Wheatley, 231-32.

These four lots, together with a First Folio, are from the sale of Richard Farmer; the sale is renowned for its size.
Appendix S/P 7

PRICES OF THE FOUR FOLIOS
1700-1799

The sources for Table K are Appendixes S/P 5 for the First Folio and S/P 6 for the other three Folios.

Table K

Prices of the Four Folios by Decade
in the 1700s

Where it seems clear, details of volumes in booksellers’ catalogues, as opposed to auction catalogues, are distinguished by being in *italics*.

* Denotes that the source describes the volume as ‘Imperfect’ or something similar that would reduce the value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third with date of imprint</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1700s</td>
<td>£1/6/-</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1/2/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730s</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/-</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1/7/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/6</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1/5/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£1/5/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£1/5/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740s</td>
<td>15/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/.*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750s</td>
<td>£10/-</td>
<td>£2/12/6</td>
<td></td>
<td>14/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/3/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760s</td>
<td>£8/18/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/-</td>
<td>£1/1/-</td>
<td></td>
<td>14/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£5/1/-</td>
<td>£1/11/-</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1/2/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£5/7/6</td>
<td>£1/11/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£5/10/-</td>
<td>£1/1/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770s</td>
<td>£1/1/-</td>
<td>£5/10/-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/-</td>
<td>18/-</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1/1/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/6</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1/1/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/6*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780s</td>
<td>19/-</td>
<td>£1/11/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/-</td>
<td>£2/11/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£1/1/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£1/3/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£1/2/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£1/6/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£2/9/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£1/6/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

348 The price for the First Folio sold on 7 September 1781 is omitted because Lee said it included two other books. The price for the Fourth Folio sold on 5 May 1788 is omitted because it contained three other books. The price for the volume sold on 20 February 1786 is omitted, for it is not clear which Folio it is.

349 I have arbitrarily reduced the price recorded for the First Folio in the Samuel Baker catalogue, 14 March 1765, by £1, for the Quarto *Othello* is apparently included with it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>First (£)</th>
<th>Second (£)</th>
<th>Third (£)</th>
<th>Fourth (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1790s</td>
<td>£35/14/-</td>
<td>£21/-/8</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>7/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£21/-/8</td>
<td>£11/15/-</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>10/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£15/-</td>
<td>£11/15/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£73/10</td>
<td>£11/15/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£18/18/-</td>
<td>£11/15/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£7/-/-</td>
<td>£11/15/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£41/-/-</td>
<td>£11/15/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table L

Eighteenth-Century Prices of the Four Folios
When in the Same Catalogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sale 250</th>
<th>First (£)</th>
<th>Second (£)</th>
<th>Third (£)</th>
<th>Fourth (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 Mar 1765 Dr Joseph Letherland</td>
<td>5/7/6 251</td>
<td>1/4/-</td>
<td>1/3/-</td>
<td>1/2/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Feb 1786 John Henderson</td>
<td>Imperfect 19/-</td>
<td>Imperfect 7/-</td>
<td>15/-</td>
<td>8/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Apr 1787 Richard Wright</td>
<td>10/-/-</td>
<td>2/9/-</td>
<td>bound in russia 1/8/-</td>
<td>1/1/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 May 1798 Richard Farmer</td>
<td>7/-/-</td>
<td>3/3/-</td>
<td>2/2/-</td>
<td>1/-/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

250 The catalogues can be found through Munby and Coral, using the date.
251 Arbitrarily reduced by £1 as in the previous table.
## PRICES OF OTHER AUTHOR'S FOLIOS IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

### Table M

**Folio Prices of Selected Authors on Random Dates 1732-1770**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Work &amp; Date</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Date of Catalogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont and Fletcher</td>
<td>Works nd</td>
<td>9/-</td>
<td>May 1732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works 1679</td>
<td>10/6</td>
<td>Jul 1758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works 1647</td>
<td>4/6</td>
<td>May 1765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plays 1679</td>
<td>£1/1/-</td>
<td>Mar 1770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works Best Edit</td>
<td>18/-</td>
<td>---- 1770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowley</td>
<td>Works 2 vol 1700</td>
<td>6/-</td>
<td>Mar 1732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works 1669</td>
<td>4/-</td>
<td>Apr 1732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works 1703</td>
<td>7/6</td>
<td>Oct 1739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaucer</td>
<td>Works 1561</td>
<td>7/-</td>
<td>Mar 1732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works 1602</td>
<td>10/6</td>
<td>Nov 1739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works 1721</td>
<td>£1/4/-</td>
<td>Mar 1756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works 1561</td>
<td>10/6</td>
<td>Feb 1757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works 1687</td>
<td>2/-</td>
<td>Mar 1757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works 1721</td>
<td>£1/1/6</td>
<td>Mar 1770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davenant</td>
<td>Works 1673</td>
<td>7/-</td>
<td>Feb 1734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dryden</td>
<td>Plays 2 vol 1701</td>
<td>£1/5/-</td>
<td>Feb 1734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Com, Trag, Oper 2 vol nd</td>
<td>£1/-/-</td>
<td>Oct 1739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Plays 2 vol 1701</td>
<td>£1/-/-</td>
<td>Nov 1739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plays 2 vol 1701</td>
<td>14/-</td>
<td>---- 1770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonson</td>
<td>Works 1692</td>
<td>18/-</td>
<td>Feb 1734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works 1640</td>
<td>8/-</td>
<td>Mar 1756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works 1692</td>
<td>15/-</td>
<td>Jul 1758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works 2 vol 1616 &amp; 1631</td>
<td>3/-</td>
<td>May 1760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works 2 vol 1640</td>
<td>6/-</td>
<td>Mar 1770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works 1692</td>
<td>14/-</td>
<td>---- 1770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spenser</td>
<td>Works 1679</td>
<td>17/6</td>
<td>Feb 1756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works 1679</td>
<td>9/-</td>
<td>Mar 1757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works 1679</td>
<td>15/-</td>
<td>Mar 1757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix S/P 9

SALES AND PRICES OF THE FIRST FOLIO
1800-1899

A starting point in seeking First Folio sales and prices in the nineteenth century is Lee’s Census, which has good coverage.\(^2\) When other Lee sources and several sources other than Lee are added to those from the Census, it is possible to find ample price examples for analytical purposes. Using Pollard, 1915, I have consulted the original, priced, auctioneer’s catalogue (invariably in the British Library) whenever one was recorded and available. These can be traced through Pollard, using the date and name of sale. Occasionally, I have had to rely on a source other than an auctioneer’s catalogue. Tables N and O give dates of sales and Folio prices. Table N includes prices of all of Lee’s classes of Folio; Table O includes prices only of volumes in Lee’s Class I. An asterisk (*) before the date in Table N indicates that Second, Third and Fourth Folios were sold in the same sale. The prices of all four are given in Appendix S/P 6.

Prices are expressed as follows: whole numbers are pounds sterling, and up to 999 are shown as such (eg, £121 = 121); if there are shillings and pence—say twenty pounds fifteen shillings and sixpence—they are shown thus: 20/15/6. When prices reach the thousands, they are expressed in units of 1000, followed by a ‘K’; thus, seventeen hundred pounds is shown as 1.7K. Dollar prices have been converted to pounds using the standard exchange rate for the period of 5, which is the rate Lee used. Offered and advertised prices may be mentioned, but have been omitted from column 2.

In Table N, the first item in column 3, for ready reference, is the copy’s Lee number if known. If it is not known, I indicate the nature of the binding and/or give other information to help identify the volume. Normally the next item is the auctioneer’s name, followed by the lot number in the sale catalogue. The name of the vendor follows, then the name of the purchaser. The source for the vendor, the purchaser and the price, unless otherwise stated, is the sale catalogue. ‘Lee, 1924’, followed by a page number refers to Lee’s 1923 lecture published in 1924. ‘Livingston, iv’ followed by a page number refers to volume iv of Auction Prices of Books, cited earlier. This captures some Folio sales missed by Lee, including several

\(^2\) His coverage seems also to be remarkably complete. I have many times checked if a price from another source was in the Census and found it there. For example, all of the nineteenth-century prices in Bernard Quaritch, ed., Contributions Towards a Dictionary of English Book-Collectors (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1969, Reprint of edn., 1892-1921) are in the Census.
in America. (For tracing a Livingston volume, there is additional information about it in Livingston, not relevant here and therefore not given here.)

### Table N

**Sales and Prices of the First Folio 1800-1899**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Sale</th>
<th>Price £/s/d</th>
<th>Lee Number, Auctioneer and Lot Number, Vendor, Purchaser</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 May 1801</td>
<td>14/14/-</td>
<td>Sotheby’s, 587. Sale of Samuel Ireland. Purchaser: Dr Mathew Raine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 November 1805</td>
<td>23/12/6</td>
<td>Lee 60. Purchased at the sale of Dr A Browne’s books by Trinity College, Dublin (Note pasted to binder’s leaf in the volume). Price from Lee 60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1808</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Lee, 1924, 97. Lee does not identify the copy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 August 1816</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Winstanley, 1348 (MS: ‘a very bad copy’). Sale of William Roscoe. No purchaser recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>121/16/-</td>
<td>Lee 1: at Midgeley’s sale, purchased by Thomas Grenville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>18/7/6</td>
<td>Lee, Census, Introduction, 15: Marquis of Blandford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*8 March 1824</td>
<td>49/7/-</td>
<td>R H Evans, 1012. Sale of George Nassau. Purchaser: Thorpe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 April 1825</td>
<td>19/19/-</td>
<td>Sotheby's, 2696. Sale of William Barnes Rhodes. Purchaser: Hardingly (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>89/5/-</td>
<td>Lee, Census, Introduction, 15: Denbigh sale. See 2 July 1832.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*16 March 1829</td>
<td>85/1/-</td>
<td>R H Evans, 7564. Sale of George Hibbert. Purchaser: John Wilks. See 12 March 1847.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*5 June 1834</td>
<td>57/15/-</td>
<td>Sotheby's, 5760. Purchaser: Philips. Same copy as 2 July 1832.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 June 1834</td>
<td>2/2/-</td>
<td>George Robins, 93. Sale of Edmund Kean. Purchaser not recorded. All from Munby, xii:374.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*4 December 1837</td>
<td>8/8/-</td>
<td>R H Evans, 1643 (&quot;wanting the title page and all the prefatory leaves, the text of the plays complete, Russia&quot;). Sale of William Combes. Purchaser: Lilly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lee, 1924, 101: purchased by the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, with the other three Folios, each for £20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1840</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Lee 8: 'Purchased c 1840 by Robert Stayner Holford'. See 12 December 1827.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Lee 5: 'acquired of Pickering by George Daniel'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*10 June 1844</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Lee 64. Sotheby's, 756. Sale of Thomas Jolley. Purchaser: Rodd. See 23 April 1823.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Lee 11: 'acquired of Thomas Rodd [bookseller] by T P Barton'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1850</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Lee 145: sold by 'T. &amp; W. Boone, booksellers of London...to W. E. Burton'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 February 1851</td>
<td>141/10/-</td>
<td>Lee 18: Charles Watkin Williams Wynn copy purchased by James Beaufoy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1 July 1853</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Sotheby's, 1187. Sale of Rev. Dr Edward Craven Hawtrey. Purchaser: Pickering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td></td>
<td>Otteson, 73, has 163/13/-, omitted here on the assumption that it is the same as the 163/16/- in 1855.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1855</td>
<td>163/16/-</td>
<td>Lee 29, from Winsor 8: sale of James Baker; bought for James Lenox. (Lee, 1924, 97, says £163 in 1854').</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1860</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Livingston, iv, 123: Burton, 4698; morocco, $375.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>9/10/-</td>
<td>Lee 140: 'Sold at [W F] Fowle's sale' for $47.50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 August 1865</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>Lee 7 (wrongly says 1855). Sotheby's, 132. Pollard, 1915, Index, identifies this as the sale of Francis William Caulfield, 2nd Earl of Charlemont. Purchaser: Ellis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| November 1865 | 525 | Lee 7 (wrongly says 1855): purchased by the Earl of Crawford. 

235 This sale and those below from Livingston (April 1883, April 1889, and May 1895) are not recorded in Pollard, 1915. The name preceding the lot number is either the owner of the book sold (if given in Livingston's source) or the auctioneer (Livingston, 1, x).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Catalogue</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 15 June 1870 | Fragment  | Sotheby's, 573. Sale of several libraries. Only 370 leaves: bought by Hebblethwaite for £7/15/-.
| 1870         | 360       | Lee 33: "possibly [this is] the copy acquired by Samuel Addington . . . for £360 in 1870'. See 24 May 1886. |
| *1877       | 200       | Otness, 74. Seller/Dealer: Quaritch. |
| 20 February 1878 | 480     | Lee 36: 'Purchased at the sale of [Col Robert Tait] by Mr Charles H Kalbfleisch'. |
| 1878        | 716       | Same as previous copy: $3,580 (New Shakespeareana, 2, no. 1, 27). |
| c. 1880     | 12        | Lee 126: 'purchased c 1880 by [Percy Fitzgerald]'. |
| 23 March 1882 | 238     | Sotheby's, 448 ('green morocco extra, Harleian tooling, g. e. by J. Clarke'). Sale of A J B Beresford-Hope. Purchaser: Ellis. |
| April 1883  | 240       | Livingston, iv, 123: Harris, 2041; morocco, $1,200. |
| 1884        | 750       | 'Copy purchased by Mrs. Pope: $3,750' (New Shakespeareana, 2, no. 1, 27). |

254 Nicolas Barker, Bibliotheca Lindesiana (1977), 214.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lee 59 says 'purchased by Samuel Sandars'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 April 1887</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>Wheatley, 229, refers to the sale of 'Hartley's copy ... in 1887 for £255'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pollard, 1915, records the sale of Leonard Lawrie Hartley at Puttick and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simpson's, 18 April 1887, but the British Library has been unable to trace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the catalogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 July 1887</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Sotheby's, 35 ('Russia extra ... gilt edges ... J. Clarke'). Sale of William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lee 85 says acquired by J W Pease for £200.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 November 1888</td>
<td>1.2K</td>
<td>Lee 32. New Shakespeareana, 2, no. 1. 27: 'Copy sold privately by Quaritch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(now Mr. Church's): $6,000'. (Date from Lee 32.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advertised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lee 6: 'Quaritch advertised it for sale in Athenaeum 1888 for £880. Purchased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 March 1889</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>Livingston, iv, 123: Kennedy, 662; morocco, $1400.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 December 1889</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lee 27. Sotheby's. Sale of 'Other Properties' (Catalogue, p 87).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Lot 1420. Purchaser: Quaritch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subsequently acquired by [Sir Edward Durning Lawrence]'. See 29 April 1815.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>Lee 14: at the sale of Brayton Ives 'in 1891 it fetched $4,200'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 June 1892</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>Lee 39. Sotheby's, 793. From the Library of a Collector. Purchaser: Ellis [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; Elvey], who sold it in October to Marshall C Lefferts (Lee 39).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Lee 133: 'sold, 1892, to Sotheran' (bookseller). See 12 March 1891.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Henry Clay Folger purchased Folger 55. Price not found.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>old calf, sprinkled edges.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

255 For this entry and the entries for 1896, 1897 and Lee 121, April 1898, see Table V, Appendix S/P 11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Offered</td>
<td>‘apparently offered for sale in 1894 for £460 by Ellis &amp; Elvey, [from whom it was acquired in] July 1899 [by] Ross R. Winans’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1895</td>
<td>11/10/-</td>
<td>Lee 129: ‘purchased by Mr. James Tregaskis . . . at a miscellaneous sale at Sotheby’s . . . soon afterwards sold by him to [Maurice Jonas]’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1895</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Livingston, iv, 124: Barger, 1425; half morocco, gilt edges, $150.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Henry Clay Folger paid $4,500 for Folger 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Henry Clay Folger purchased Folger 6. There is no price because it was purchased as part of a library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 March 1898</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Christie’s, 495 (‘red morocco extra, gilt edges, in red morocco case’). Sale of Harold Bailleie Weaver. Price from Livingston, iv, 124.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1898</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Lee, 121: ‘Sold at auction by Bangs &amp; Co. . . . for £102 ($510), to George D. Smith, bookseller . . .’. Purchased in April by Henry Clay Folger for $561--Folger 44.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 July 1899</td>
<td>1.7K</td>
<td>Lee 10; Lee, 1924, 98. ‘Christie’s, 309. Sold by a member of the Bellocher family. Purchaser: Bernard Buchanan MacGeorge. (Seller and price from Lee 10.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table O contains sales prices of those First Folios only, which are in Lee’s Class I. The source for each price can be found in column 3 of Table N for that year and price.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Price (£)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Price (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1807</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>716/2/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>121/16/-</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>112/7/-</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>110/5/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26/15/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>85/1/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1840</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1.2K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>141/10/-</td>
<td></td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>1.7K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>163/16/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>164/17/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SALES AND PRICES OF
THE SECOND, THIRD AND FOURTH FOLIOS,
AND OF THE FOUR FOLIOS TOGETHER
1800-1899

Table P contains representative sales and prices of the Second, Third and Fourth Folios in the nineteenth century, additional to those in the following table (Table U) which appeared when all four Folios were in the same sale. The sources are Wheatley (with references gathered in the following footnote\(^{256}\)), Livingston (with references gathered in the following footnote\(^{257}\)), and TLS (with references gathered in the following footnote\(^{258}\)) except as otherwise footnoted. Table U contains prices of the four Folios when in the same sale.

### Table P

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Folio (£)</th>
<th>Third Folio (£)</th>
<th>Fourth Folio (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1807 5/-/259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813 13/2/6</td>
<td>1813 16/16'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823 3/3/-260</td>
<td>1825 22/1/-</td>
<td>1826 25/-/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832 18/-/-</td>
<td>1834 3/3/-261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836 11/-262</td>
<td>1837 5/7/6</td>
<td>1837 2/5/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/7/-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838 10/-/-</td>
<td>1838 10/-/-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{256}\) The following prices are from Wheatley, 231-34: 1813, 1832, 1837 (5/7/6, 2/5/-), c. 1850, 1862, c. 1863, 1873, 1882, 1886 (Fourth Folios), 1888 (Second Folio 93/-/-, Fourth 29/-/-), 1889 (Second Folio 100/-/-, 24/-/-; Fourth both), 1891-92 (all except 80/-/-, 41/-/-), 1894 (205/-/-), 1895 (350/-/-), 1896 (the first 42/-/-) and 1897 (55/-/-).

\(^{257}\) The following prices are from Livingston, IV, 125-29: Second Folio—1860, 1871, 1888, 1890, 1891 (80/-/-), 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895, 1898, 1899; Third Folio—1886, 1888 (52/-/-), 1890 (168/-/-, 89/-/-), 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899; Fourth Folio—1888, 1890 (all), 1893, (22/10, 22/10), 1894, 1895 (all), 1896 (except the first 42/-/-), 1897, 1898 (both), 1899 (both).

\(^{258}\) The following prices are from 'Notes on Sales', TLS, 27 January 1921: Third Folio only—1825, 1826, 1837 (7/7/-), 1838, 1844, 1850 (5/5/-), 1853, 1854, 1857, 1860, 1871, 1889 (45/-/-), 1890 (27/-/-), 1894 (435/-/-), 1895 (11/-/-).

\(^{259}\) Isaac Reed sale (Munby and Coral for 2 November 1807).

\(^{260}\) This volume was from the 23 April sale of the library of David Garrick (Munby, XII).

\(^{261}\) This volume was from the 17 June 1834 sale of the library of Edmund Kean. It was bought by Charles Kean, Edmund's son (Munby, XII, 358 and 374).

\(^{262}\) This volume, described as imperfect, was from the 17 June 1836 sale of the library of William Godwin (Munby, VIII, 316).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>1/10/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>5/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>16/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>26/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>17/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>43/10/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>130/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>200/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>44/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>105/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>130/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>50/10/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>60/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>19/10/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>41/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>29/10/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>205/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>35/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This was for the purchase by Collier from the bookseller Thomas Rodd of the now-famous Perkins Folio, the centre of the notorious forgery scandal. Collier called it 'a very reasonable price' (and later 'a bargain' - 148) for a copy 'without the title-page . . . wanted several sheets at the end, -and was imperfect in the middle of the volume. . . . some of the leaves were blotted and dirty, [the binding] was greasy and shabby' (Dewey Ganzel, *Fortune and Men's Eyes: The Career of John Payne Collier* (Oxford, 1982), 143. Collier said he bought it 'in the Spring of 1849' (147-48); Ganzel says he 'probably bought [it] sometime in 1847' (151).

This volume and the Fourth Folio for £19 were from the 23 November sale of the books, etc, of William Hazlitt (Munby, I).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1896</th>
<th>1897</th>
<th>1898</th>
<th>1899</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>43/-</td>
<td>55/-</td>
<td>64/-</td>
<td>100/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>42/-</td>
<td>75/-</td>
<td>260/-</td>
<td>30/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>45/-</td>
<td>42/-</td>
<td>40/-</td>
<td>31/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>55/-</td>
<td>25/10/-</td>
<td>35/-</td>
<td>57/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

269 Sale of Charles Kean, 23 June (Munby, XII).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and Sale</th>
<th>First (£)</th>
<th>Second (£)</th>
<th>Third (£)</th>
<th>Fourth (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 May 1800 George Steevens</td>
<td>22/-/-</td>
<td>18/18/-</td>
<td>8/8/-</td>
<td>2/12/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 May 1812 Duke of Roxburghe</td>
<td>100/-/-</td>
<td>15/-/-</td>
<td>35/-/-</td>
<td>6/6/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 April 1813 Thomas Stanley</td>
<td>37/16/-</td>
<td>13/2/6</td>
<td>16/16/-</td>
<td>7/9/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 January 1821 John Philip Kemble</td>
<td>112/7/-</td>
<td>11/11/-</td>
<td>8/8/-</td>
<td>7/17/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 March 1824 George Nassau</td>
<td>49/7/-</td>
<td>7/10/-</td>
<td>16/5/6</td>
<td>6/8/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 April 1827 John Dent</td>
<td>110/5/-</td>
<td>15/-/-</td>
<td>65/2/-</td>
<td>7/10/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 March 1829 George Hibbert</td>
<td>85/1/-</td>
<td>13/-/-</td>
<td>24/-/-</td>
<td>3/9/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 July 1829 John Rennie</td>
<td>71/8/-</td>
<td>10/10/-</td>
<td>19/8/6</td>
<td>8/12/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 July 1832 John Broadley</td>
<td>51/-/-</td>
<td>12/5/-</td>
<td>11/5/-</td>
<td>2/2/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 June 1834 Richard Heber</td>
<td>57/15/-</td>
<td>9/15/-</td>
<td>26/10/-</td>
<td>4/4/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 December 1837 William Combes</td>
<td>8/8/-</td>
<td>4/4/-</td>
<td>5/7/6</td>
<td>2/5/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 June 1844 Thomas Jolley</td>
<td>86/-/-</td>
<td>25/-/-</td>
<td>17/10/-</td>
<td>3/4/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 March 1847 John Wilks</td>
<td>155/-/-</td>
<td>11/11/-</td>
<td>25/10/-</td>
<td>8/4/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 January 1849 Stowe House</td>
<td>76/-/-</td>
<td>11/15/-</td>
<td>35/-/-</td>
<td>4/6/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 July 1853 Edward Hawtrey</td>
<td>63/-/-</td>
<td>15/-/-</td>
<td>20/-/-</td>
<td>4/14/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 July 1854 John Dunn Gardner</td>
<td>250/-/-</td>
<td>18/10/-</td>
<td>25/-/-</td>
<td>13/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 July 1864 George Daniel</td>
<td>716/2/-</td>
<td>148/-/-</td>
<td>46/-/-</td>
<td>21/10/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 July 1867 George Smith</td>
<td>410/-/-</td>
<td>58/-/-</td>
<td>43/-/-</td>
<td>10/10/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 February 1871 Thomas Corser</td>
<td>160/-/-</td>
<td>49/-/-</td>
<td>77/-/-</td>
<td>12/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 May 1874 Sir William Tite</td>
<td>440/-/-</td>
<td>45/-/-</td>
<td>79/-/-</td>
<td>18/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877 Quaritch (Otteshaw, 74)</td>
<td>200/-/-</td>
<td>40/-/-</td>
<td>120/-/-</td>
<td>25/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 March 1882 Beresford Hope</td>
<td>238/-/-</td>
<td>35/10/-</td>
<td>72/10/-</td>
<td>24/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 March 1882 Frederic Ouvry</td>
<td>420/-/-</td>
<td>46/-/-</td>
<td>116/-/-</td>
<td>28/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 December 1884 Sir John Thorold</td>
<td>590/-/-</td>
<td>15/-/-</td>
<td>30/-/-</td>
<td>20/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 July 1886 Nathaniel P. Simes</td>
<td>71/-/-</td>
<td>27/-/-</td>
<td>35/-/-</td>
<td>12/10/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 July 1887 William Brice</td>
<td>105/-/-</td>
<td>19/-/-</td>
<td>29/10/-</td>
<td>14/10/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 June 1894 Birket Foster</td>
<td>255/-/-</td>
<td>56/-/-</td>
<td>130/-/-</td>
<td>25/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 May 1898 Earl of Ashburnham</td>
<td>585/-/-</td>
<td>90/-/-</td>
<td>190/-/-</td>
<td>55/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 June 1898 Roger W. Wilbraham</td>
<td>190/-/-</td>
<td>44/-/-</td>
<td>106/-/-</td>
<td>20/-/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix S/P 11

FOLGER FIRST FOLIO PURCHASES

Columns 4 and 6 (reference name(s) and price paid in US dollars) in the following table are quoted, with exceptions noted, from a seven-page list at the Folger Library, referred to hereafter as the ‘Folger Price List’. For the dates in column 5, I am indebted to Donald Farren, who compiled the First Folio Catalogue of Folger copies for the Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN) on-line database. Other sources are recorded in the footnotes. ‘Provenance files’ refers to a set of files, one for each of seventy-nine copies of the First Folio in the Folger Shakespeare Library, stored in the Library’s Catalogue Department. The order of the copies is by date of purchase. This is to facilitate viewing the pattern of Folger’s purchases over three-and-a-half decades as well as seeing the progression of prices.

In addition to the reference name and the price, the Folger Price List gives varying additional information on each copy, such as size and condition. For twelve copies only there is a date; in each case it reconciles with the date provided by Donald Farren. The Price List has no Folger numbers and only a few Lee numbers. Further, it contains gaps (eg, no price for Folger 1; no mention of Folger 40, 55, 60 or 62) and errors (two entries seem to be duplications; some Lee numbers are wrong). It makes no reference to Lee, 1906 (in which six Folger copies can be identified). With the exception of some sequences, it is in random order. For the foregoing reasons it was necessary to compare data from different sources for most copies to establish a match. To match Folger numbers, Lee numbers, reference names, date of purchase and price paid, I used—in conjunction with the Folger Price List—Lee, Census; Lee 1906; and Folger Cat RLIN. I have succeeded in identifying all seventy-nine volumes to which Folger gave a number, but failed to find a match for two copies on the Price List.\[270\]

The prices include any commission paid by Folger. For example, the Hoe copy (Folger 7) fetched $13,600 at the Anderson Auction Co sale on 1 May 1911 and Folger’s recorded price is $14,300; again, in writing his cheque for Folger 9 and 58, Folger added 5% to the price bid by Quaritch at the Sotheby’s auction. The exchange rate used in this table for those purchases shown in the source in sterling is £1 = $5.

Folger 80, 81 and 82, discussed in Chapter 5, are not included in Table V. The only sales and price information I have on these copies is that Folger 80 was purchased in December 1926 and Folger 82 in January 1920; the price paid for Folger 82 together with the other items in the same lot, which included three additional plays and a number of additional leaves, was $1,250.\[271\]

\[270\] The Price List has the ‘Ivins copy, 12 1/4 x 8 1/8”, title, verse & last leaf facs. Not in Lee [$4000.00], and the ‘Ellis copy, 402 leaves, 12 1/4", poor [$1575.00].

\[271\] The sources of this information are noted in Chapter 5, Appendix D 1.
Table V

Prices of Henry Folger's First Folio Purchases by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folger No.</th>
<th>Lee No.</th>
<th>West No.</th>
<th>Reference Name(s)</th>
<th>Date of Purchase</th>
<th>Price Paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td>?1893</td>
<td>$272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Pope</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>$272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td>Apr 1898</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Kalffleisch</td>
<td>c. 1900</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Frederickson-McKee</td>
<td>Apr 1901</td>
<td>892.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Vincent-Sibthorp</td>
<td>Jan 1903</td>
<td>48,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Jona</td>
<td>May 1903</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>78a</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Hilhouse</td>
<td>May 1903</td>
<td>2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Sotheran</td>
<td>May 1903</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>Jun 1903</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td>Jun 1903</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Dutton</td>
<td>Dec 1903</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Tregaskis</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Pickering</td>
<td>Mar 1904</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>+12^78</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Lilly-Thorpe</td>
<td>Apr 1904</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Brodie</td>
<td>Apr 1904</td>
<td>2,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Duff</td>
<td>Jul 1904</td>
<td>2,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Sotheran</td>
<td>Jul 1904</td>
<td>1,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>[Nov] 1904</td>
<td>1,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>John Scott</td>
<td>Mar 1905</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Tweedmouth</td>
<td>Dec 1905</td>
<td>7,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Denny</td>
<td>Feb 1906</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Admiral Harvey</td>
<td>Jun 1906</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>'First Folio' [Fitzgerald]</td>
<td>Jun 1907</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Sotheby</td>
<td>Jul 1907</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Ferrens</td>
<td>Feb 1909</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Amherst</td>
<td>Mar 1909</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Amherst</td>
<td>Mar 1909</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Hawkins-Garnett</td>
<td>Apr 1910</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Sotheby</td>
<td>Jul 1910</td>
<td>3,060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

272 The Folger Price List gives no price for this copy, the earliest of Folger's First Folio purchases.
273 No separate price because Folger purchased the Folio as part of a library.
274 Date and price, Blayney, 45. The 'Vincent-Sibthorp copy' is the first item on the Folger Price list, but the List gives no date or price.
275 The Folger Price List says $1575, but the invoice from Sotheran, 2 April 1903, in the Provenance file for this copy, says £350; $1,750 is presumably therefore more accurate.
276 The price is from the Provenance file for this copy. The Folger Price List has $360 for the 'Spencer copy'.
277 Pickering and Chatto invoiced Folger, 10 February 1904, for £250. Folger made a note that he offered £225, 11 March 1904. A cable to Folger, 21 March 1904, saying 'Accepted Pickering', presumably accepted the £225 (Provenance file for this copy). The Folger Price List has $1,100 for the 'Pickering copy . . . Not in Lee'.
278 Figures in this column preceded by a + sign refer to a numbered copy in Lee, 1906.
279 This price is from the Provenance file for this copy. The Folger Price List has $1,250 for 'Sotheran unbound copy'.

---

272 The Folger Price List gives no price for this copy, the earliest of Folger's First Folio purchases.
273 No separate price because Folger purchased the Folio as part of a library.
274 Date and price, Blayney, 45. The 'Vincent-Sibthorp copy' is the first item on the Folger Price list, but the List gives no date or price.
275 The Folger Price List says $1575, but the invoice from Sotheran, 2 April 1903, in the Provenance file for this copy, says £350; $1,750 is presumably therefore more accurate.
276 The price is from the Provenance file for this copy. The Folger Price List has $360 for the 'Spencer copy'.
277 Pickering and Chatto invoiced Folger, 10 February 1904, for £250. Folger made a note that he offered £225, 11 March 1904. A cable to Folger, 21 March 1904, saying 'Accepted Pickering', presumably accepted the £225 (Provenance file for this copy). The Folger Price List has $1,100 for the 'Pickering copy . . . Not in Lee'.
278 Figures in this column preceded by a + sign refer to a numbered copy in Lee, 1906.
279 This price is from the Provenance file for this copy. The Folger Price List has $1,250 for 'Sotheran unbound copy'.
The price is from the Provenance file for this copy, using an exchange rate of 4.8565, the rate which Folger used in writing his cheque to Quaritch. The Folger Price List has $3,100 for the 'Sotheby [copy] July 22, 1910'.

Bernard Quaritch offers a gloss on this and the next purchase in a letter to Folger: 'The Gott folio at £1800 . . . is not so fine as the Buckley-Hargreaves copy, which I think you obtained cheaply. I consider it equal to the Hoe copy; but I expect when this copy comes up for sale, it will go for much higher than £2000' (Signed letter from Bernard Quaritch to H C Folger, 29 July 1910—Provenance File for Copy 58). As we see below, Folger in fact obtained the Hoe copy in May 1911 for about £2,860.

What became Folger 29 was (rffered in Maggs catalogue, 1910, item 115, for £900. Folger (roed and Maggs accepted £800. Later, Folger wrote to Maggs about its condition and the facsimiles done by Rivière, with the result that Maggs reduced the price to £700 (Provenance file for this copy). The Folger Price List has $3,400 for the 'Maggs copy'.

Table W for 16 March 1914.

The price is from the Provenance file for this copy.

Net of the price paid at the same time for a Second Folio and of half the expenses charged (Provenance file for this copy).

Folger tried to buy the First Folio only and was willing to pay '$2,500 or even $3,000', but from the Provenance file for this copy it appears that the best counter-offer he received was $4,400 for the First together with a Second and Fourth. I have assumed he paid this and would have allocated $3,000 to the First.

This copy was acquired apparently by exchanging it for a copy Folger had bought for $8,800 (Blayney, 43-44). Though the $6,600 from the Folger Price List does not reconcile with this, it is close to the $6,000 Folger offered for the copy in 1919.

Folger purchased the First Folio together with a Third and Fourth for $19,000, for the First alone he wrote $13,000 in his notes (Provenance file for this copy).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Copy</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Gott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Buckley-Hargreaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Maggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Gaißford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Holham-Hilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Crockett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Hoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Mary Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Hamner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Elizabethan Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Sabin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Brockett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Vaughan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Hutchinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Plymouth Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>[A B Stewart]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Beaufoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>[Feb] 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Bulley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>[Apr] 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Swift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Stevens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Wilbraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Fitzwilliam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Vernon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Leighton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Gilburne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>40?</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Elliot-Baker-Wilbraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Sabin-Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Vernay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Sheldon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>'Wyndham'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Fitzherbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Earl of Kimberly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Perkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Llandaff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Stevens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Geo. S. Hellman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Thos. Killigrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Wantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Ingleby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Hacket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Toft Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

289 From the Provenance file after subtracting the price and proportionate expenses of two Elizabethan manuscripts. Folger Price List has $1,725.

290 Folger 76 is the Bishop Percy copy. Beneath the end of the Price List is one manuscript note, 'Bishop Percy copy', with no price.
Appendix S/P 12

SALES AND PRICES OF THE FIRST FOLIO
1900 TO THE PRESENT

The three tables in this appendix contain information on the sales and prices of the First Folio in the present century. Table W is a detailed record. It does not include Folger’s private purchases, as this would merely repeat data recorded in the previous appendix. Copies in this table which became Folger volumes can be identified by referring to Table X which follows.

The purpose of Table W is twofold. First it houses the data for analysing sales and prices. Second, it records information—for example regarding provenance, auctioneer, buyer and condition—useful for other purposes, such as the examination of other aspects of the Folio’s history and the study of book history in general. Some of this second category of information is omitted if the source identifies the copy (e.g., with a Lee number), but information which served to identify a copy is included. Brief, readily visible details of bindings are usually included as a complementary means of quick recognition, even if the copy has been identified.

The principal sources are Sotheby’s catalogues in the British Library, Christie’s catalogues in their London archives to which Christie’s kindly gave me access, Book-Auction Records (BAR), American Book-Prices Current (ABPC) and Rosenbach, Biography. These copies of Sotheby’s and Christie’s catalogues normally give the seller; this is important because BAR, for example, gives the vendor from the catalogue title-page, rather than for the lot or relevant section of the auction, and can therefore be quite misleading. Further, these Sotheby’s and Christie’s catalogues contain in manuscript an invaluable record of prices and buyers. In the fifties, Sotheby’s catalogues in the British Library cease to contain these manuscript notes. Though the Library has price lists with buyers on sheets supplied by Sotheby’s, the holding appears to be incomplete; accordingly, I have used BAR or ABPC when necessary. Other sources searched include: CBVP, JDA and PACSL. Full references to all these sources are given in the List of Cue Titles preceding this chapter. In addition I searched the annotated copies of Lee, Census, at Sotheby’s, Quaritch, Shakespeare Centre (Sidney Lee’s), the Folger Library (Henry Folger’s and A C R Carter’s) and Morris Library of Southern Illinois (W W Greg’s), all shown in the List of Manuscripts Cited. To save space, the four Folios are respectively referred to by the sigla: F1, F2, F3 and F4, the four Folios together being F1-4.

To interpret the table, the following should be noted:

291 BAR I is organised by sale, while BAR 1.1 and all following volumes are organised alphabetically by author. Some entries in BAR I are repeated in BAR 1.1. BAR 1.1 and 1.2 do not have a ‘Key to Sales’—so that one cannot tell from whose library a volume came unless it is also mentioned in BAR 1.
292 PACSL for the years 1902-1930 only—kindly given to me by Donald Farren.
- The column headings indicate the contents of the table.
- In column 1, the date is normally the first day of the sale, though BAR gives the date of the actual sale of the volume.
- When the Lee number in column 2 is in square brackets [ ], it indicates that it does not appear in the source, but is deduced from available information. This information is usually given in column 3, item 4. A Lee number preceded by a ‘+’ sign refers to the number given to that copy in Lee, 1906. Column 2 is blank if I have not identified a Lee number or have not concluded that the volume is non-Lee. I have made various attempts to identify these volumes, for example, searching in Lee, Census; Lee, 1906; Lee, 1924; and Lee, 1931; checking non-Lee copies to the extent that I have information; and searching the list of Minsheu subscribers mentioned earlier. Other attempts to identify them are mentioned in Chapter 4, Part B, The Search for the New Census, Pursuing Missing and Unmatched Copies, item 9.
- Given the constraints of space, the information in column 3 is selected, summarised or abbreviated. There may be additional information in the source.
  Where there is no entry--eg, no buyer in column 3--it can be assumed that the source is silent.
  In column 3, item 2, the lot number usually follows the auctioneer’s name.
  In column 3, item 4, very poor or excellent condition, when given in the source, is usually noted as a silent comment on the price.
- In column 4, the figures are hammer prices, not including buyers’ premiums if any. When F1-4 are sold together, the price given is for the package.
  A triangle in column 4 (Δ) indicates that the sterling price is not given in the source. The $ exchange rate used is the standard £1 = $5 up to 1935. After that exchange rates appear in column 4. The source for exchange rates in entries from BAR is BAR itself. Where BAR gives only the high and low for exchange rates in a given year, the median is used.
- The main information source is given in column 5 (or, if space is lacking, in item 4 of column 3 with a cross-reference in column 5). References to additional sources follow the information derived from them. Additional comments, not from one of the sources, are enclosed in square brackets [ ].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lee No. or Non-Lee</th>
<th>1. Provenance Information/Source</th>
<th>2. Auctioneer, Lot Number</th>
<th>3. Buyer (or Agent)</th>
<th>4. Binding/Comment, etc</th>
<th>5. Information Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>20 Mar</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1. Augustin Daly. 2. [Auctioneer?], 2987, New York. 3. James W Ellsworth, New York.</td>
<td>4. Morocco, gilt edges, 12¾ by 8 in; most of the t-p, 'To the Reader', 3b6, corners of 6 leaves, &amp; several other smaller deficiencies in the text, in facsimile; some rust holes mended, several leaves stained.</td>
<td>$5,400 $1,080Δ</td>
<td>Lee 33 and Livingston, iv, 124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Argyll. 2. [Auctioneer?], 1428. 4. Morocco, gilt edges, 12¾ by 8 in; most of the t-p, 'To the Reader', 3b6, corners of 6 leaves, &amp; several other smaller deficiencies in the text, in facsimile; some rust holes mended, several leaves stained.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$252</td>
<td>Livingston, iv, 124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>[140]</td>
<td>1. McKee. 2. [Auctioneer?], 2600. 4. Morocco, 13 by 8¾ in; the 9 preliminary leaves, including portrait, &amp; the last 9 leaves, beginning with p 383, in facsimile; many leaves remargined.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$850 $170Δ</td>
<td>Livingston, iv, 124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>17 Mar</td>
<td>[40]</td>
<td>1. Property of G B Baker Wilbraham, Esq. 2. Sotheby’s, 784. 3. Pickering. 4. Russia gilt by Roger Payne.</td>
<td></td>
<td>£620</td>
<td>Sotheby’s Cat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Apr</td>
<td>[41]</td>
<td>1. Library of late Lt Col Edward George Hibbert. 2. Sotheby’s, 725. 3. Pickering. 4. Red morocco, gilt edges, by Bedford.</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,050</td>
<td>Sotheby’s Cat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Jun</td>
<td>[132]</td>
<td>2. Sotheby’s, 1059. 3. Tregaskis. 4. Poor copy. Brown morocco, gilt edges.</td>
<td></td>
<td>£88</td>
<td>Sotheby’s Cat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Library of H J Hussey. 2. Sotheby’s, 272. 3. Quaritch. 4. Old calf.</td>
<td></td>
<td>£52/10/-</td>
<td>Sotheby’s Cat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Lote</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Jun</td>
<td>[86]</td>
<td>2. Sotheby’s, 564. 3. Sothean. 4. Red morocco, gilt edges, by Pratt. [Lee no. identified through Lee, 1906, 11, where Lee refers to Folger’s purchase; = Folger 33.]</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>Sotheby’s Cat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Jun</td>
<td>[80]</td>
<td>1. Portion of the Library of the late Baron de Hocheepied Larpent, Collection of J G Maitland, etc. 2. Sotheby’s, 493. 3. Pickering. 4. Crushed crimson morocco by Bedford. [Lee no. identified through Lee, 1906, 11, where Lee refers to Folger’s purchase; = Folger 34.]</td>
<td>£385</td>
<td>Sotheby’s Cat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Library of the late Mr William Henry Dutton, Hewcroft, Newcastle, Staffs. 2. Sotheby’s, 247. 3. Sothean. 4. Half calf. 291 leaves.</td>
<td>£41</td>
<td>Sotheby’s Cat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Jun</td>
<td>[+4]</td>
<td>2. Sotheby’s, 544. 3. Pickering. 4. Old russia, gilt edges, probably bound about 1770.</td>
<td>£950</td>
<td>Sotheby’s Cat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Mar</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>1. Turbutt copy. 3. Bodleian Library, with funds raised by appeal. 4. The original Bodleian copy.</td>
<td>£1790</td>
<td>PACSCL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PACSCL refers to 'the original folio editions' at the Sotheby’s sale on 6 December 1905, but there is no evidence in the Sotheby’s Catalogue, and I have no explanation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 Jun</td>
<td>Property of a titled Lady. 2. Sotheby’s, 924. 3. Quaritch. 4. Old calf.</td>
<td>£245</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sotheby’s Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 Apr</td>
<td>1. Sale of library of Sir Henry St John Mildmay, Dogmersfield, Hants. 2. Sotheby’s, 467. 3. Quaritch. 4. Blue morocco, gilt edges.</td>
<td>£680</td>
<td>Sotheby’s Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 May [124]</td>
<td>1. Formerly belonged to William Brocket, of the Middle Temple, and has his ex libris. 2. Sotheby’s, 228. 3. Pickering.</td>
<td>£305</td>
<td>Sotheby’s Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 Jul [Non-Lee]</td>
<td>2. Sotheby’s, 202. 3. Sothean. 4. Cat says 165 leaves and in error ‘H. Herringman, etc. 1623”. [= Folger 66].</td>
<td>£45</td>
<td>Sotheby’s Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov 13</td>
<td>1. Dodd, Mead. 4. [Luther S Livingston], The Four Folios of Shakespeare’s Plays (New York: Dodd, Mead &amp; Co, 1907).</td>
<td>£3,850</td>
<td>Sotheby’s Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 Dec [22]</td>
<td>1. Works of Shakespeare, the property of Earle Howe. 2. Sotheby’s, 37. 3. Edwards. 4. Excellent copy, genuine and original throughout. Contemporary calf.</td>
<td>£2,025</td>
<td>Sotheby’s Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>20 Mar [+] [4+3]</td>
<td>1. Sale of library of Bishop John Gott. 2. Sotheby’s, 232. 3. Thompson.</td>
<td>£3,850</td>
<td>Sotheby’s Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 Jul [+] [4+3]</td>
<td>1. Library of Bishop John Gott. 2. Sotheby’s, 297. 3. Quaritch. 4. Binder C Lewis.</td>
<td>£1,800</td>
<td>Sotheby’s Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Jul</td>
<td>[Non-Lee]</td>
<td>2. Sotheby's, 242. 3. Quaritch. 4. Half bound. 'The text is perfect, except a few letters in [3b5]'</td>
<td>£600</td>
<td>Sotheby's Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Dec</td>
<td>[109]</td>
<td>1. Sale of library of W H Hilton. 2. Sotheby's, 1641. 3. Quaritch. 4. Russia gilt, gilt edges.</td>
<td>£400</td>
<td>Sotheby's Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 Apr</td>
<td>1. The late Mr Robert Hoe. 2. Anderson Auction Co, New York.</td>
<td>£2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 May</td>
<td>1. The late Sir John Evans, KCB, FRS, President of the Society of Antiquaries and Trustee of the British Museum, Nash Mills, Hemel Hempstead, Herts. 2. Sotheby's, 550. 3. Quaritch. 4. Binder R de Coverly.</td>
<td>£105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 Nov</td>
<td>1. Property of a Nobleman. 2. Sotheby's, 137. 3. Sabin. 4. Old calf, arms of the Earl of Limerick, 17c.</td>
<td>£1,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 Nov</td>
<td>[9] 1. The library collected by Henry Huth and augmented by his son Alfred H Huth. 2. Sotheby's, 1187. 4. Lots 1187 to 1228, the Shakespeare collection [including F2-4], were sold en bloc privately.</td>
<td>See item 4 in column 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 Dec</td>
<td>[Non-Lee] 1. Property of a nobleman. 2. Sotheby's, 409. 3. Quaritch. 4. Blue morocco, by Orrock. [Though the sale contained the library of James S Burra, including an F2, (Sotheby's Cat), this is not Lee 139. It is Folger 51.]</td>
<td>£500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 Jul</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1. Library of Henry B H Beaufoy. 2. Christie's [one lot only]. 3. Quaritch. 4. With Roger Payne's bill for renovating and binding. [The bill is at the Folger.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Mar</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2. Sotheby's, 662. 3. Quaritch. 4. Crimson morocco by W Pratt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Jul</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1. Property of Sir A Dryden.</td>
<td>2. Sotheby's, 596.</td>
<td>3. Sabin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Jul</td>
<td>[79]</td>
<td>1. E E Hutchinson [in MS].</td>
<td>2. Christie's, 150.</td>
<td>3. Lacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Dec</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>2. Sotheby's, 445.</td>
<td>3. Quaritch.</td>
<td>4. Half morocco.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Jan</td>
<td>[21]</td>
<td>1. Chatsworth copy--Duke of Devonshire.</td>
<td>2. Sold privately through Montague Barlow at Sotheby's &amp; G D Smith, bookseller.</td>
<td>3. H E Huntington.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Jul</td>
<td>Non-Lee</td>
<td>1. Bookplate of Thomas Fitchett Marsh.</td>
<td>2. Sotheby's, 1041.</td>
<td>3. Sabin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Aug</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>'Sold Christie's' [but purchased by Folger in July = Folger 39. I found no Christie's sale].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nd 72</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>4. 'Sold privately with 3 other folios 1916 £1200' (Sotheby's copy of Lee, Census).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nd 75</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>1. Dryden copy, on approval from Quaritch.</td>
<td>2. Rosenbach.</td>
<td>3. Commander Morton V Plant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Apr</td>
<td>[Non-Lee]</td>
<td>1. From the Library of George W Fitzwilliam.</td>
<td>2. Sotheby's, 294.</td>
<td>3. Quaritch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Nov</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>2. Sotheby's, 705.</td>
<td>3. Quaritch.</td>
<td>4. 261 loose leaves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Nov</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4. Quaritch letter 18 November 1918 to Howard Pease in file of Meisei copy 2, described in Chapter 3 below.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

224 BAR 10, 519, for price and buyer. There are manuscript notes in Christie's catalogue that seem to indicate the volume originally went for £750, and that Mayhew then offered £286, but did not confirm his offer. There is no mention of Lacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 Apr</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1. Property of a Lady. Autograph signature of T. Baerstock, of Marlborough, 1784. Bookplate of Thomas Merriman. 2. Sotheby's, 700. 3. Quaritch. 4. Old half calf. £1,500 Sotheby's Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Dec</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1. Sale of Britwell Court Library. 2. Sotheby's, 81. 3. G.D. Smith purchased F1-4. 4. F1: brown Russia by Roger Payne. F1: £2,300 F2: £420 F3: £2,400 F4: £165 Sotheby's Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nd</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1. The MacGeorge set. 2. Rosenbach. 3. Joseph E Widener. F1-4: $60,000 £12,000A Rosenbach Biography, 115 &amp; 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Jan</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1. Sir Francis Newdigate, Arbury Hall, Warwickshire. 2. Sotheby’s, 290. 3. 18c Russia gilt. No price or buyer in Cat Sotheby’s Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Apr</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1. Capt A.W. Clifford, Chestal. 2. Sotheby’s, 449. 3. Quaritch. 4. Olive green morocco. (“Presumably the copy described under No. 970 in Quaritch’s “Catalogue” of April 1922, . . . containing the first issue of the portrait’-BPC). £4,200 Sotheby’s Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Jul</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1. Lady Hamilton [in MS]. 2. Christie’s, 12. 3. F. Sabin. 4. Old rough calf. £1,000 Christie’s Cat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[295] £1,550 was the price paid in the post-sale settlement among book dealers. At the sale itself, because of the operation of the ‘ring’, the price recorded was £100 bid by Quaritch (Anatomy of an Auction, vii, 61-62 and 94-95).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>[Non-Lee]</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>14 Mar</td>
<td>1. The late J Herbert Foster, Providence, RI.</td>
<td>$8,300 (ABPC) £1,660£</td>
<td>PACSCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Levant morocco by Rivière (ABPC).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 May</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. The late Theodore N Vail, New York.</td>
<td>$9,500 (BPC) £1,900£</td>
<td>PACSCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. ‘Crimson straight-grain mor, richly gold tooled on back and sides in Roger Payne fashion’ (BPC).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Sotheby’s, 399. 3. Rosenbach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Sotheby’s, 402. 3. Rosenbach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 May</td>
<td>Non-Lee</td>
<td>1. Reginald H Leon.</td>
<td>£440</td>
<td>Sotheby’s Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Sotheby’s, 138. 3. Maggs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Jun</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Property of a lady.</td>
<td>£550</td>
<td>Sotheby’s Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Sotheby’s, 512. 3. Sabin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Rough calf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Nov</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1. The late Richard Johnson, Manchester, and now the property of a lady.</td>
<td>£5,900</td>
<td>Sotheby’s Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Sotheby’s, 397. 3. Sabin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Red morocco, gilt edges, by C Lewis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Sotheby’s, 149. 3. Maggs.</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td>BAR 19, 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Direct purchase.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Rosenbach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nd</td>
<td>[75]</td>
<td>1. Dryden-Plant copy.</td>
<td>F1 alone:  £30,000 £6,000£</td>
<td>Rosenbach Biography, 150-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Rosenbach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Frank B Bemis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>3 Feb</td>
<td>1. Henry Gardner Denny, Roxbury, MA.</td>
<td>£1,000+ (see col 3, item 4)</td>
<td>Lee, 1906, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3. ‘A collector from New York’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Sold with F2-4. The F1 ‘may fairly be reckoned to have brought more than £1,000’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Sotheby’s, 598. 3. Quaritch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Wants first 14, last 14 and 6 other leaves. Red morocco, gilt edges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Folger 53 is non-Lee.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 July</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1. From the library of the Earl of Carysfort.</td>
<td>£6,100</td>
<td>Sotheby’s Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Sotheby’s, 15. 3. Quaritch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Crimson morocco by Clarke &amp; Bedford.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

296 Otness, 74, has ‘Vail $9,500’ in 1923, but with no source.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 Apr</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Sotheby's</td>
<td>1. Sir Hugo Fitzherbert. 2. Sotheby's, 415. 3. Maggs. 4. Brown niger morocco, gilt edges.</td>
<td>£1,600</td>
<td>Sotheby's Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Jul</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Sotheby's</td>
<td>1. Library of Col H G Sotheby. 2. Sotheby's, 181. 3. Sabin. 4. Modern red morocco, gilt edges.</td>
<td>£2,375</td>
<td>Sotheby's Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson Galleries, 379.</td>
<td>2. Anderson Galleries, 379. 4. Red crushed morocco, gilt back, gilt panelled sides, inside borders, gilt edges, by Rivière in a blue straight-grain morocco solander case.</td>
<td>$11,750</td>
<td>BPC 39, 797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Apr</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Sotheby's</td>
<td>2. Sotheby's, 470. 3. Sabin. 4. Old calf, one joint broken. Lacks Ben Jonson verses and all of <em>Troilus and Cressida</em>.</td>
<td>£2,350</td>
<td>Sotheby's Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Jun</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hodgson, 606. 3. Maggs.</td>
<td>4. Old sheep.</td>
<td>£300</td>
<td>BPC 40, 809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Jul</td>
<td>[Non-Lee]</td>
<td>Sotheby's</td>
<td>1. Property of a nobleman. This copy probably belonged to Thomas Killigrew the elder. 2. Sotheby's, 200. 3. Gabriel Wells. 4. Original calf. [Folger 73 is non-Lee.]</td>
<td>£1,800</td>
<td>Sotheby's Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Jun</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Rt Hon Lord Leigh.</td>
<td>1. Rt Hon Lord Leigh. 2. Sotheby's, 636-639. 3. Gabriel Wells. 4. Blind stamped russia, gilt edges.</td>
<td>£1-4:</td>
<td>£6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Nov</td>
<td>[Non-Lee]</td>
<td>Sotheby's</td>
<td>2. Sotheby's, 488. 3. Quaritch. 4. 193 out of 454 leaves. [Folger 74 has 193 leaves and is non-Lee].</td>
<td>£330</td>
<td>Sotheby's Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Dec]</td>
<td>[Non-Lee]</td>
<td>Rosenbach</td>
<td>1. Wantage-Crawford copy, on approval from Quaritch. 2. Rosenbach. 3. Mrs Edward Harkness. 4. F1-4 + 1640 Poems: $80,000; £16,000Δ</td>
<td>See col 3, item 4</td>
<td>Rosenbach Biography, 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 May</td>
<td>[134 A]</td>
<td>Christie's</td>
<td>1. The late Miss E A Williams. 2. Christie's, 76. 3. F Sabin. 4. Brown morocco by Zaehnsdorf.</td>
<td>£4,000</td>
<td>Christie's Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Jun</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sotheby's</td>
<td>1. Property of a nobleman. Note of ownership on t-p in 17c hand 'Robert : Wynne : Bodescallen'. 2. Sotheby's, 565. 3. Quaritch. 4. Old rough calf binding, c. 1700.</td>
<td>£8,500</td>
<td>Sotheby's Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Jul</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>The late Clement Mansfield Ingleby.</td>
<td>Sotheby's, 561. 3. Gabriel Wells.</td>
<td>Bought by 'Wells for [Folger]' (De Ricci slip).</td>
<td>£2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Nov</td>
<td>Lee, 1931, 733</td>
<td>Property of R D Leycester, Esq. Toft Hall, Knutsford.</td>
<td>Sotheby's, 501. 3. Gabriel Wells.</td>
<td>Maroon morocco gilt, gilt edges.</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Jul</td>
<td></td>
<td>Property of a lady.</td>
<td>Sotheby's, 61. 3. Maggs. 4. Only 386 leaves: 86 from F1, 300 from F2. 18c boards.</td>
<td></td>
<td>£66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Dec</td>
<td>[67]</td>
<td>Library of J T Adams, Esq.</td>
<td>Sotheby's, 221. 3. Gabriel Wells.</td>
<td>Red morocco gilt, gilt edges, by Bedford.</td>
<td>£1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Jul</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>John Claude Daubuz.</td>
<td>Sotheby's, 129A. 3. Marks.</td>
<td></td>
<td>£100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nd</td>
<td>[53]</td>
<td>Levi Leiter, Washington.</td>
<td>Direct purchase. 3. Rosenbach.</td>
<td>'Pristinely crisp in its original binding'.</td>
<td>F1-4: $45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1932</td>
<td>[53]</td>
<td>Levi Leiter set.</td>
<td>Rosenbach.</td>
<td></td>
<td>F1-4: £75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td>American Art Association, 96. 4. Red morocco, gilt tooled, gilt edges, by Rivière.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£14,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Jun</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Rt Hon the Earl of Rosebery. Manley-Rosebery copy. [cf 24 April 1946.]</td>
<td>Sotheby's, 1113. 3. Rosenbach. 4. Russia c. 1800, gilt edges.</td>
<td></td>
<td>£14, 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Nov</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Major G Harcourt Vernon.</td>
<td>Sotheby's, 156. 3. How.</td>
<td>Brown morocco.</td>
<td>£2,800 (bought in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

297 'How' is a codeword for 'bought in'. The fact that this volume was bought in is confirmed by a note in Sotheby's copy of Lee, Census: 'b/i £2800'.

298 Source for Lee number and for item 3: Letter 10 June 1991 from Elisabeth A Jocz, University of Toronto.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1935    | 136         | 1. Amos Prescott Baker, Boston, MA.  
2. Rosenbach.  
4. Letter 17 December 1991, from the Rosenbach Museum & Library. | $7,500 £1,500Δ | See column 3, item 4 |
| 4 Mar   | 31          | 1. F1-4 of Francis Calley Gray (c. 1836) and Miss Mary Edgecumbe Blatchford (1879).  
2. Sotheby's, 349-52.  
3. Robinson.  
4. Four volumes uniformly bound in blue leather by Hayday. | F1-4: £3,100 | Sotheby's Cat |
| 8 Apr   |             | 1. Property of H Pomeroy Salmon.  
2. Sotheby's, 371.  
3. Maggs.  
4. A fragment of 73 leaves, unbound. | £31 | Sotheby's Cat |
4. Full salmon morocco, gilt edges, by Lewis.  
'Charles Sessler' (Note in Sotheby's copy of Lee, Census). | $28,000 £7,000Δ (@ $4) | BPC 50, 649 |
2. Sotheby's, 25.  
4. Diced russia gilt, gilt edges. | £5,600 | Sotheby's Cat |
| 120     |             | 1. George F Richardson, Lowell, MA.  
2. Rains Galleries, New York.  
4. Letter 17 December 1991 from Rosenbach Museum & Library. | £3,800 £950Δ (@ $4) | See column 3, item 4 |
| 1938    | Non-Lee     | 1. Lord Suffield, Gunton Park, Norwich.  
2. Sotheby's, 765.  
4. 17c red morocco, panelled sides, gilt.  
'Non-Lee' from Sotheby's copy of Lee, Census. | £600 | Sotheby's Cat |
2. Anderson Galleries. | Anderson Galleries Cat |
| 1939    | 85          | 4. Quaritch offer. See description of Meisei 2 in Chapter 3 below. | £2,000 | See column 3 |
4. Binder Zaehnsdorf. | $5,200 £1,300 (@ $4) | BAR 38, 196 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Jun</td>
<td>Non-Lee</td>
<td>1. Property of the late Mrs V L H Tighe, Woodstock, Co Kilkenny. Bookplate of Rt Hon Wm F Fownes Tighe.</td>
<td>2. Sotheby's, 172.</td>
<td>3. Keen.</td>
<td>4. 18c diced calfs. [cf 26 Oct 1970.]</td>
<td>£400</td>
<td>Sotheby's Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>24 Apr</td>
<td>1. The Frank J Hogan Library. 'The Manley-Ld. Rosebery copy with Manley's armor bkplt. &amp; Ld. Rosebery's &amp; Mr. Hogan's bk labels'.</td>
<td>2. Parke-Bernet, 126. 4. Russia, c. 1800, gilt edges, morocco case.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$12,500 ($4)</td>
<td>BAR 43, 532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Jul</td>
<td>+11</td>
<td>1. Mrs [Winifred L] Clowes.</td>
<td>2. Sotheby's, 197. 3. Foyle. 4. Russia.</td>
<td></td>
<td>£340</td>
<td>Sotheby's Cat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Nov</td>
<td>1. Mrs J B Hirston. 'The Lord Suffield bkplt'. 2. Parke-Bernet, 184. 4. 'Full old russia, gt (binding rubbed), with the Edward Lord Suffield bookplate, in a cl. case' (BPC).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,900</td>
<td>£1,475 ($4)</td>
<td>BAR 44, 535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>28 Jan</td>
<td>1. From the libraries of 'The late H V Jones and others'. 'John Gribbel's copy with bkplt'.</td>
<td>2. Parke-Bernet, 103 (ABPC has 106). 4. 'Full brown diced russia, artistically gt. tooled . . . g. e., by Roger Payne, in a crimson mor. straight grain solander case' (BPC).</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>£1,750 ($4)</td>
<td>BAR 44, 535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Feb</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1. Bookplates of Lord Leigh and Frederick S Peck. 2. Freeman, 199.</td>
<td>4. Bound in old stamped russia.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,200</td>
<td>£800 ($4)</td>
<td>ABPC 53, 419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Apr</td>
<td>Non-Lee</td>
<td>1. The Rowfant Club-Willis Vickery-Allsopp copy.</td>
<td>2. Parke-Bernet, 262. 4. Bound in rose levant morocco, gilt edges, by Pratt. [Dartmouth College copy is non-Lee.]</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,750</td>
<td>£1,438 ($4)</td>
<td>ABPC 53, 419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Lot No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Buyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Sotheby's, 42. 3. Maggs.  
4. Modern red morocco.                                                                                                                                  | £440  | Sotheby's Cat  |
| 12 May | [85]    | 1. 'The Aylesford copy'.  
3. Apsley Cherry-Garrard.  
4. Binder Staggemeier & Welscher.                                                                                                                   | F1-4: | BAR 45, 519    |
|       |         |                                                                                               | £7,100 | Sotheby's Cat  |
2. Sotheby's, 107. 3. Maggs.  
4. Uniformly bound, red morocco gilt, gilt edges, by Rivière for Pickering.                                                                      | F1-4: | Sotheby's Cat  |
|       |         |                                                                                               | £1,900 |                |
3. Louis H Silver.  
4. The price included other books.                                                                                                                    | See column 3, item 4 | Rosenbach        |
2. Parke-Bernet, 640.  
4. Lee 96 'book-plate' has 'Auchincruive'.  
[Both Lee, Census, copy 96, and BAR 47, 386, have $A_1$ and $A_1+1$ in facsim.]. 'Red mor by Zaehnsdorf'; in mor case (BPC). | $7,100 | BAR 47, 386    |
|       |         |                                                                                               | £2,536Δ (@ $2.80) |                |
| 1951  | 113     | 1. The late Lord Peckover of Wisbech.  
2. Sotheby's, 632. 3. R C Pearson.  
4. Red morocco, gilt edges, by Tout.                                                                                                                   | £780  | Sotheby's Cat  |
2. Parke-Bernet, 545.  
4. 'Levt. mor. gt., g. e. by Pratt, in levt. mor. book-shaped case'. [Dartmouth College copy is non-Lee.]  
[Parke-Bernet has error in Lee number.]                                                                                                               | $3,250 | BAR 49, 446    |
|       |         |                                                                                               | £1,161Δ (@ $2.80) |                |
| 10 Dec | 134A    | 2. Parke-Bernet [no lot no.].  
4. BAR has error in Lee number. ABPC 59, 487, confirms this is Lee 134A.                                                                             | F1-4: | BAR 50, 359    |
|       |         |                                                                                               | $7,700 |                |
|       |         |                                                                                               | £2,750Δ (@ $2.80) |                |
2. Sotheby's, 473. 3. Fisher.  
4. 179 leaves only. Mottled calf, gilt edges, by Lloyd.                                                                                           | £150  | Sotheby's Cat  |
<p>|       |         |                                                                                               |                   | Price &amp; buyer from BAR 54, 380. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 Dec</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Property of James Ford Bell, Minneapolis, MN.</td>
<td>Sotheby's, 304.</td>
<td>R J Sanders.</td>
<td>Red levant morocco by Rivière.</td>
<td>£8,500 Sotheby's Cat. Price &amp; buyer from BAR 56, 428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Feb</td>
<td></td>
<td>The late William J K Vanston.</td>
<td>Parke-Bernet, 502.</td>
<td>'Dark green lev mor, by Sanford' (ABPC 65, 453).</td>
<td>£4,000</td>
<td>£1,429Δ (BAR 56, 428)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Oct</td>
<td>[Lee, 1924, 101]</td>
<td>Property of Frederick McDonald Hall and R C Hall.</td>
<td>Sotheby's, 237.</td>
<td>[Lionel and Philip] Robinson.</td>
<td>Red morocco gilt, gilt edges, by Rivière for Pickering &amp; Co.</td>
<td>£1,300 Sotheby's Cat. Price &amp; buyer from BAR 57, 496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Jun</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Property of Morris Wolf, Philadelphia.</td>
<td>Sotheby's, 43.</td>
<td>John F Fleming.</td>
<td>[Price &amp; buyer from ABPC 67, 504-05.]</td>
<td>£1,429Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Jun</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>The late John M Robertson, Largs, Ayrshire.</td>
<td>Sotheby's, 242.</td>
<td>John F Fleming.</td>
<td>18c English panelled calf.</td>
<td>£23,000 Sotheby's Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Jul</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Property of a lady.</td>
<td>Sotheby's, 375.</td>
<td>John F Fleming.</td>
<td>19c dark red morocco, by Maclehose.</td>
<td>£4,500 Sotheby's Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Date 1</td>
<td>Date 2</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. 'Mor. gt., panel sides &amp; spine'. ('Joints cracked. With 9 preliminary &amp; 5 leaves in facsimile. 47 leaves supplied from [F2 &amp; 3]'--ABPC, 1969, 1054).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>26 Oct</td>
<td>Non-Lee</td>
<td>1. Bookplate of Wm F Fownes Tighe.</td>
<td>2. Sotheby's, 61.</td>
<td>3. Jenkins Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Early 19c diced russia, tooled in gilt and blind, gilt edges. [cf 1 June 1943.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>30 Jun</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Property of Major the Lord St. Oswald.</td>
<td>2. Christie's, 12.</td>
<td>3. Dawson.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. 19c green morocco, by Hayes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Red morocco, panelled in gilt, gilt edges, by Rivière. [Price &amp; buyer from ABPC 81, 893].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1 Mar</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>1. Property of London Contemporary Dance Trust [to which it had been donated by Robin Howard].</td>
<td>2. Sotheby's, 154.</td>
<td>3. Schumann.</td>
<td>4. Late 18c russia, gilt, covers loose, gilt edges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Apr</td>
<td>[Non-Lee]</td>
<td>1. Autograph letter from Edmond Malone dated 17 January 1809. ('The Bluestein copy'--ABPC.)</td>
<td>2. Sotheby's, 64, New York.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Morocco case by Rivière. [Brandeis University copy is non-Lee.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>23 Jun</td>
<td>Non-Lee</td>
<td>1. Sir Thomas Munro copy with bookplate.</td>
<td>2. Christie's, 110.</td>
<td>3. R Spencer.</td>
<td>4. Early 19c gilt &amp; blind-stamped russia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Oct</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Quaritch.</td>
<td>3. John Wolfson.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Note in Quaritch's copy of Lee, Census.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>24 Apr</td>
<td>Non-Lee</td>
<td>1. Property of a gentleman. Bookplate of Barron Field.</td>
<td>2. Sotheby's, 22.</td>
<td>3. Burgess.</td>
<td>4. 18c diced russia, gilt, rubbed, gilt edges. See description of Meisei 4 in Chapter 3 below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2. Yushodo Booksellers, Tokyo.</td>
<td>3. Meisei University, Tokyo.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. See description of Meisei 2 in Chapter 3 below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 Oct</td>
<td>Non-Lee</td>
<td>2. Sotheby's, 191.</td>
<td>3. Spencer.</td>
<td>4. 18c boards, rubbed, newer sheep spine, morocco box. Only 387 leaves. [Price &amp; buyer from BAR 76, 434.]</td>
<td>£4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Vendors</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Oct</td>
<td>[Non-Lee]</td>
<td>2. Yushodo Co, Booksellers, Tokyo. 3. Meisei University, Tokyo. 4. See description of Meisei 4 in Chapter 3 below.</td>
<td>See column 3, item 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>H P Kraus, USA, and Maruzen Company, Japan. 3. Konan Women’s University. 4. See description in Chapter 3 below.</td>
<td>$150,000 £76,923Δ (@ $1.95)</td>
<td>See column 3, item 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 May</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1. Library of Arthur A Houghton, Jr. 2. Christie’s, 415. 3. Quaritch. 4. '17th C cf, rebkd &amp; reprd with orig spine prsvd, in red mor pull-off c.' See description of Meisei 1 in Chapter 3 below.</td>
<td>£80,000</td>
<td>BAR 77, 425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Jun</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1. The Prescott Collection. 2. Christie’s, 290, New York. 4. Late 18c English diced russia gilt. [Price from BAR 78, 437.]</td>
<td>$210,000 £388,500Δ (@$1.85)</td>
<td>Christie’s Cat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>6 Feb</td>
<td>84. Late 18c English diced russia gilt. [Price from BAR 78, 437.]</td>
<td>$210,000 £388,500Δ (@$1.85)</td>
<td>Christie’s Cat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>13 May</td>
<td>68. Late 18c English diced russia gilt. [Price from BAR 78, 437.]</td>
<td>$210,000 £388,500Δ (@$1.85)</td>
<td>Christie’s Cat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1047</td>
<td>2. John F Fleming. 3. Meisei University, Tokyo. 4. See description of Meisei 7 in Chapter 3 below.</td>
<td>$580,000 £411,348Δ (@ $1.41)</td>
<td>BAR 82, 542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>2. Yushodo Co, Booksellers, Tokyo. 3. Meisei University, Tokyo. 4. See description of Meisei 9 in chapter 3 below.</td>
<td>See column 3, item 4</td>
<td>See column 3, item 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>2. John F Fleming. 3. Meisei University, Tokyo. 4. See description of Meisei 8 in Chapter 3 below.</td>
<td>$580,000 £411,348Δ (@ $1.41)</td>
<td>BAR 82, 542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H P Kraus. 2. Sotheby's, 100, New York.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F1-4: $1,900,000 £1,234,000Δ (@ $1.54)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BAR 87, 532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. [Meisei University--seen there, 1991.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|        |           | 4. [F1-4 $900,000 (oral report) = £549,000Δ @ $1.64. See description of  
|        |           | Meisei 10 in Chapter 3 below.]                                               |
| 28    | 130       | 1. 10th Duke of Leeds Will Trust.                                            |
| Nov    |           | 2. Christie's, 115.                                                         |
|        |           | 3. [Quaritch for Meisei University.]                                         |
|        |           | 4. [I recorded the price at the auction. See description of Meisei 11 in  
|        |           | Chapter 3 below.]                                                           |
|        |           | £95,000 See column 3, item 4                                                 |
|        |           | Christie's Cat                                                               |
|        |           | 2. Sotheby's, 276, New York.                                                |
|        |           | 4. [F1-4 bought in at $1.2 mil (Sotheby's Price List) = £666,700Δ @ $1.80).] |
| 5 Dec  | 113       | 1. Copy of A Peckover, Wisbech.                                              |
|        |           | 2. Christie's, 324, New York.                                               |
|        |           | 4. Red morocco, gilt edges, by Tout & Sons.                                  |
|        |           | $90,000 £50,000Δ (@$1.80)                                                    |
| 1993-  | 148       | The Garden First Folio, which was bought in when Richard Manney put it in  
| 1994  |           | the Sotheby's auction, 11 October 1991, passed to Louis Weinstein, Heritage  
|        |           | Books. In June 1994 Louis Weinstein wrote to me: 'You can list myself . . .  
|        |           | as the owner'. The set changed hands twice in 1994 (Letter from H P Kraus,  
|        |           | New York). In July, 1995, it was owned by Stuart Rose, Springboro, OH (Note 
|        |           | from the owner). I have no price information.                               |
| 29 Oct | 134       | 1. Victor Jacobs, Dayton, OH.                                                |
|        |           | 2. Sotheby's, 419, New York/                                                |
|        |           | 3. Stuart Rose, Springboro, OH.                                              |
|        |           | 4. [Price and item 3 from oral report.]                                     |
|        |           | $225,000 £139,752Δ @$1.61                                                    |
|        |           | Sotheby's Cat                                                                |
Table X gives a summary of prices for the First Folio in the present century by year. The sources are Table W above in this appendix and Table V in Appendix S/P 11, with the Folger prices in the latter divided by five to convert them to pounds. In Table X the Folger prices in any given year follow in sequence those from Table W, and are identified with an 'F'. All the prices from the Folger list, except the two in the nineteenth century and those identified below, are included.

The following explains which prices in Tables V and W are not included in Table X. I have attempted to choose those prices which best represent the value of First Folios.

- Estimate, bought-in and offer prices have been dropped—that is, for those copies in Table W cited in or on 18 November 1918, 13 November 1933, August 1938, 1939 and 11 October 1991; thus the prices used for analysis in this section, as in the nineteenth-century and seventeenth-century sections, are all sales prices.

- To increase the validity of the price data, the prices of some copies known to be particularly defective have been excluded on the basis of information in Folger Cat RLIN and/or the Table W sources. In the absence of details that could come only from inspecting each volume, the criteria for dropping copies may have been applied inconsistently, but excluding the following at least removes some of the most defective copies: of the Folger copies (Table V), Folger 48, 64, 45, 57, 66, 40, 65 and 74 and of the copies in Table W, those sold on 3 June 1902 (became Folger 45), 8 December 1903 (became Folger 64), 11 December 1913, 14 November 1918 (became Folger 65?), 11 December 1922, 7 November 1927 (became Folger 74), 13 July 1931, 17 June 1957, and 17 October 1978. Other defective copies—for example, in Lee's Class III—are included.

- Where I have found a match between a sale in Table W and an immediate purchase (within two, in one case three, months) by Folger, I have omitted the Table W price to avoid double-counting. This involves some thirty-five copies (excluding defective ones). Where there is a lapse of time (nine to twenty-one months) between a copy's appearance in Table W and its appearance on the Folger Price List, I have given both prices (Folger 11, 23, 34, 69 and 72). (There was also a long gap between the appearances of Folger 74 (nearly five years), but it was already excluded as defective.)

- Where a copy appears twice in Table W, that is, two separate sales, with Folger procuring it on its second appearance, I give the Table W price for the first sale and the Folger price for the second (Folger 9, 13, 18 and 77).
When the four Folios are sold together for an inclusive price, the figure given in the table for the First Folio is 56% of this total. This follows Lee’s precedent in Lee, 1906, 12. This arbitrary percentage is close to its equivalent calculated when there is a separate price for each of the four Folios in the same catalogue (Appendix S/P 7, Table L, excluding the one with an imperfect First Folio). If anything, this percentage understates the price of a First. The average percentage in the nineteenth century was around 68% (based on Appendix S/P 10, Table U) and on one occasion Lee used 70% (Lee 1924, 98).

### Table X

Summary Record of Prices of the First Folio by Year, Including Folger Purchases (F), 1900 to the Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Price (£)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Price (£)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Price (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>240 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,300 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,190 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,800 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>260 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>105 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,860 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>620</td>
<td></td>
<td>680</td>
<td></td>
<td>132 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td></td>
<td>305</td>
<td></td>
<td>500 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,330 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,584</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,746 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>150 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,750 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>450 F</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>2,156</td>
<td></td>
<td>974 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>350 F</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>700 F</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>1,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>165 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>440 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>994 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>440 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>790 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>253 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td></td>
<td>51 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>220 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,100 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>190 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>90 F</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>2,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>525 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>612 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>441 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,852 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>370 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,040 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>600 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>680 F</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>700 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>270 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,250 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,210 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,460 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>420 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>600 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Price (£)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Price (£)</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>1,917</td>
<td></td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>3,136</td>
<td></td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>3,136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>3,360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>7,280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td></td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,720</td>
<td></td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>2,650</td>
<td></td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>440</td>
<td></td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td></td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,550</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>690</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,826</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,414</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,346</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td></td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>255</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>2,375</td>
<td></td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td></td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td></td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The £7,280 is arrived at by arbitrarily subtracting £3,000 for the 1640 Poems sold with the four Folios for £16,000 and multiplying the result by the standard 56% to get a value for the First Folio.
Table AA contains sales prices of those First Folios only, which are in Lee’s Class I. The source for each price can be found either in Table V in Appendix S/P 11 or in Table W above in this appendix. Folger’s purchases (from Table V) are identified by an ‘F’. This table includes prices for Lee +1, +3 and +4, three of the Folios Lee discovered soon after the publication of his *Census* and which he placed in his Class I.\textsuperscript{300}

\begin{center}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
Year & Price (£) & Year & Price (£) \\
\hline
1900 & 1,080 & 1919 & 6,720 \\
 & 1,800 F & 1921 & 4,200 \\
1901 & 1,720 & 1922 & 2,600 F \\
1902 & 620 & 1925 & 5,900 \\
 & 1,050 & 1928 & 10,414 F \\
1904 & 950 & 1935 & 5,346 F \\
1905 & 5,600 & 1923 & 6,100 \\
1907 & 3,600 & 1925 & 6,400 F \\
 & 2,400 & 1928 & 9,500 F \\
 & 3,584 & 1936 & 1,736 \\
 & 2,025 & 1941 & 7,000 \\
1908 & 2,156 & 1946 & 5,500 \\
1910 & 1,852 F & 1960 & 26,473 \\
 & 2,040 F & 1965 & 12,880 \\
1911 & 2,860 F & 1976 & 15,000 \\
1912 & 1,960 & 1978 & 76,923 \\
1914 & 3,100 F & 1985 & 411,348 \\
1916 & 2,520 & \\
1918 & 3,136 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\end{center}

\textsuperscript{300} Lee, 1906, 13-20.
Appendix S/P 13

SALES AND PRICES OF THE SECOND, THIRD AND FOURTH FOLIOS, AND THE FOUR FOLIOS TOGETHER
1900 TO THE PRESENT

Table CC gives prices and number of sales of the Second, Third and Fourth Folios for selected years in the twentieth century. Except where footnoted, the source is *BAR*, volumes 1a, 8, 18, 28, 38, 48, 58, 68, 78, 88, 89, 90, and 91. The chosen years are the decennials (with the exception of 1902/3, which is the first in the *BAR* series), for which average prices are given, and the last five years, for which individual prices are given. The figures in this table are only indicative; they ignore condition and represent sales in an arbitrary selection of years. An asterisk (*) indicates an exchange rate of £1 = $2.80.
Table CC
Indicative Prices of the Second, Third and Fourth Folios
in the Twentieth Century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Second Folio</th>
<th>Third Folio</th>
<th>Fourth Folio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Prices £</td>
<td>Number of Sales</td>
<td>Average Prices £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902/03</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910/11</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920/21</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930/31</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940/41</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950/51</td>
<td>153*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960/61</td>
<td>424*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970/71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980/81</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Prices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990/91 £1.93</td>
<td>7,254</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,487</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991/92 £1.87</td>
<td>19,250</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992/93 £8.29 F</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993/94 £1.54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,429</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994/95 £1.52</td>
<td>32,895</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,289</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26,315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,526</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

301 One Second Folio in 1974 fetched $8,000 (= £2,857) and one in 1976 fetched £3,800 (CBVP, 1974-75 and 1975-76, 692).
302 Two copies of the Second Folio in 1991/92 were priced in catalogues at £38,000 and £12,000 ('News and Comment', Book Collector, 41 (1992), 85-110 (87)).
303 ABPC, 1993, 941.
304 ABPC, 1994, 916.
305 ABPC, 1995, 1074-75.
Table DD, derived from Table W in Appendix S/P 12, shows twentieth-century sales of the four Folios together. Not included are additional prices mentioned by Otness (74-77)—these appear to be for the four Folios sold separately; in the sales below the four apparently went as a package.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Sale</th>
<th>Price (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1906</td>
<td>1,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1907</td>
<td>Offer 6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1908</td>
<td>3,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 1912</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1914</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1918</td>
<td>5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1919</td>
<td>5,285306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 1927</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1927</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1928</td>
<td>5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

306 For this sale there is a separate price for each Folio. Exceptionally, the Third outpriced the First: First £2,300, Second £420, Third £2,400 and Fourth £165.
307 £16,000 less an arbitrary £3,000 for the 1640 Poems sold with the four Folios.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1935</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>10,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1948</td>
<td>7,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 1948</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1952</td>
<td>2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1958</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 1961</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 1965</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1965</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1989</td>
<td>1,234,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 1990</td>
<td>549,000&lt;sup&gt;308&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>308</sup> The source for this price is documentation filed with Meisei 10 (exchange rate £1 = $1.64).

The twenty-nine purchases in Table DD, together with the purchases of Meisei 5, 7 and 8, all of which were bought as a set, and the two sales of the Garden set since 1989, make a total of thirty-four sales. I have no prices for Meisei 5, 7 and 8. A summary of Meisei copies appears in Chapter 3, Table 3.
Chart 2
All First Folios: Average Price by Decade 1790s-1850s

Chart 3
Class I and Class II-IV First Folios: Individual Prices 1790-1862

$\circ = \text{Prices of Class II-IV First Folios}$

$\bullet = \text{Class I First Folios}$

Chart 4
All First Folios: Average Price by Decade 1860s-1970s

Chart 5
Prices: Gutenberg Bibles and First Folios 1793-1978

Plate 6. A betaradiograph of one of the dozen or so crown watermarks in First Folio paper. From signature F2 in *Measure for Measure* in West 31 at the Bodleian Library, Oxford.
### Part II: Bibliographical Description

This Part presents a model for describing First Folios and then demonstrates the use of the model. The copies described were selected to ensure enough variety, in particular of the types of descriptive problems which Folios present, to help develop and to test the model.

#### Chapter 2

**A Model for Describing First Folios**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTRODUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendixes**

| M 1 | CROSS-REFERENCE TABLE: THE PRELIMINARIES |
| M 2 | CROSS-REFERENCE TABLE: THE TEXT |
| M 3 | LIST OF PRESS-VARIANTS |

**Tables**

| A | Model for Describing First Folios |
| B | Cross-References to Variants |
INTRODUCTION

This chapter begins by examining and presenting the reference notation used for describing copies (and also used throughout this work), provides two 'roadmaps' for finding one's way around the First Folio, and covers how measurements are made. It then presents a model for describing the First Folio and outlines the scope and content of each element of the model.

A REFERENCE NOTATION

The reference notation used in the description of Folio copies is the standard collational formula. The formula has evolved since W W Greg's time, largely through the work of Charlton Hinman and Peter Blayney. Greg's formula was as follows:

\[ \text{A6(A1+1) [B]}^2; A-Bb^6\ Cc^2; a-g^6\ gg^8\ h-v^6\ x^4; [1, 2] \]
\[ \text{gg}^6\ \text{gg}^6\ \text{gg}^1\ aa-ff^6\ Gg^2\ \text{Gg}^6\ hh^6\ \text{kk-bbb}^6. \] (Greg, First Folio, 436)

Hinman modified Greg's formula in four ways. One of these, the use of \( \chi 1,2 \) to signify the two non-conjugate leaves just before signature \( \text{f} \), was made obsolete by one of Blayney's changes. (It was item (c), omitted in the following quotation.) The three other changes were:

(a) superscript \( \pi \)'s are used with the designators for the preliminary signatures A and [B] in order to... distinguish them from the two signatures, also A and B, which begin the text proper... ; (b) the gathering of eight leaves that is signed 'gg' is given a superscript \( \chi \) because this signature... requires differentiation from the other gg signature, from the 'gg' that follows 'aa-ff'... ; and (d) the formula for the signatures \( \text{gg}^6 \) and \( \text{gg}^6 \) is \( \text{gg}^6\ \text{gg}^6\ ) (... a standard condensation). (Hinman, i, 30)

Thus Hinman's formula, which includes the format (2\( \phi \)), was as follows:

\[ 2\phi. \pi^A^6\ (\pi^A^1+1) [\pi^B]^2; A-Bb^6\ Cc^2; a-g^6\ xg^8\ h-v^6\ x^4; \chi 1,2 \]
\[ \text{gg}^6\ \text{gg}^6\ \text{gg}^1\ aa-ff^6\ Gg^2\ \text{Gg}^6\ hh^6\ \text{kk-bbb}^6. \] (Hinman, i, 30)

---

1 There are a number of differences between this version of Greg's formula and the version in his A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration, 4 vols (1939-59), III, 1109, but all have to do with the signing or punctuation marks he uses (eg, italic rather than square brackets for an inferred signature and no semi-colons) rather than a different interpretation of how the book was printed or made-up.
Peter Blayney has introduced two principal changes to Hinman’s formula. (Some readers may find it helpful to refer to Appendix M 1, the ‘roadmap’ to the preliminaries, if they happen not have a Folio to hand.) The first has to do with the order of the preliminaries. What Greg had designated [B]2 and Hinman [B]2, Blayney designates (A5+1:2). The fact that the order is not uniform in all copies had been noted for a long time. In the early years of this century, for example, Lee drew attention to the fact in his Census (copies 14, 33, 84, 115); Greg addressed the subject in 1903 and Pollard in 1909; and George Watson Cole made a comparative study of a number of copies in 1908. Fredson Bowers summarised the state of play in 1949: ‘The ideal order of the preliminaries . . . has never been established.’ After this, Greg again considered their order and so did Hinman. Peter Blayney’s departure from Greg and Hinman first occurred as far as I am aware in his unpublished descriptions of Lee 148/West 175 in 1989 and of the University of Nebraska Folio (West 154) in 1991. His arguments are repeated in his ‘Notes on the First Folio collation and variants’:

Hinman, following Greg . . . assumed that the unsigned preliminary bifolium containing the verses by L. Digges and I. M. and the list of actors was intended to follow A6 (Catalogue, verso blank). He therefore designated that bifolium [B]2, and reproduced it after A6 in the Norton Facsimile.

The very fact that the bifolium is unsigned makes that suggestion rather unlikely, because if Jaggard had intended it to follow a gathering signed ‘A’ he would surely have signed it ‘B’. The contents logically belong before the Catalogue (the verses belong with those on A4-5, and the Catalogue should immediately precede the text), and the title page has a stub between A5 and A6 on to which the bifolium can conveniently be tipped. Furthermore, the bifolium is actually found before the Catalogue in most of the best-preserved copies (including those in original bindings) whose preliminaries seem to be original.

The two leaves that Hinman referred to as [B]1 and [B]2 (pp. 15-18) in the [1968] Norton facsimile are now called A5+1 and A5+2 respectively, and should be reproduced before A6 (Norton pp. 13-14), rather than as in the facsimile.²

³ ‘The First Folio of Shakespeare: A Further Word Regarding the Correct Arrangement of Its Preliminary Leaves’, reprinted with corrections, from the Proceedings and Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, 3 (1908), 65-83 (New York, 1909). On pp 73-74 Cole presents the order given in Lowndes’s Bibliographer’s Manual (Bohn edition) and gives his logic as to why he considers this order ‘correct’. It is the same as the order described by Peter Blayney below.
⁴ Principles of Bibliographical Description (Princeton, NJ, 1949), 75.
⁵ Greg, First Folio, 449-51, and Bibliography of English Printed Drama, III, 1111; Hinman, I, 32.
⁷ Peter W M Blayney, ‘Notes on the First Folio collation and variants’ (Unpublished), 1, prepared for Peter Donaldson of MIT concerning ‘which variant pages had been photographed for his [Digital Facsimile] project and why’ (Letter from Peter Blayney to me, 2 May 1996).
The square brackets [ ] used by Greg and Hinman have been dropped; now that the leaves in question have signatures showing their position in the volume, there is no need for inference.

Blayney's other major change to Hinman's formula replaces Hinman's χ1,2 with 'gg3:4'(±'gg3'):

Greg and Hinman both assumed that no copies of the Folio were issued until both Troilus and Cressida and its Prologue had been supplied. Were that the case, then it would be bibliographically correct to follow Hinman in calling the first two unsigned leaves of Troilus 'χ1,2'.

But as I have shown (The First Folio of Shakespeare, 24), the first copies to be sold with Troilus present at all were issued before the Prologue was printed. In those copies the fact that the first two leaves were originally printed for the Tragedies is more than a mere historical curiosity--because in a copy of the second issue Troilus begins with a bifolium whose first page is actually signed 'gg3', and therefore collates 'gg3:4'(±'gg3') 351.

Although the Prologue leaf that defines the third issue is unsigned, therefore, its status is that of a cancel for 'gg3' that had once been part of the book as published--so convention requires the formula for Troilus to be rendered as 'gg3:4'(±'gg3') 351. The leaves that Hinman called χ1 and χ2 (Norton, pp. 587-90) should therefore be referred to as +'gg3' and 'gg4' respectively. ('Collation and Variants', 1-2)

As Bowers says, single quotation marks are used 'to indicate that the signature is anomalous in the gathering'.

In addition to these major changes, Blayney has also introduced a standard condensation that Hinman did not use: 35 in place of 355; 3b in place of bbb. He has retained the semicolon to indicate the end of sections and the colon between leaves to indicate conjugacy (τ5+1:2). Thus, the formula is:

20: \( \tau \omega g (\tau \omega a + 1, \tau \omega a + 1:2); A-Bb^6 Cc^2; a-g^6 x_{gg^8} h-v^6 x^4; 'gg3:4'(±'gg3') 351 \)

For references to the First Folio I use this formula. I use square brackets [ ] to indicate inferred pagination for references to end-papers and binder's leaves, and also in Appendix M 1 to indicate inferred pagination in the Norton Facsimile. I use superscripts 'r' and 'v' to refer respectively to the recto and verso of a leaf, and reserve 'a' and 'b' for referring respectively to the left and right columns. To avoid any possible ambiguity, the sign for recto is never omitted even though its omission is common in bibliographical writing.

---

9 Ibid, 459. Bowers also covers quotation marks on p 238. I consulted Professor Richard Proudfoot concerning the collational formula and would like to acknowledge with gratitude his helpful comments.
B CROSS-REFERENCE TABLES: PRELIMINARIES AND TEXT

A number of factors combine to make orientating oneself in the First Folio difficult. These include the make-up of the volume; the order of printing; irregularities of the original quires; errors in signature references and pagination, or their absence; variation among scholars in the reference notation used; the different modes of referring to elements of the volume; and the difficulty of cross-referencing between these modes. Any of these can cause confusion, even to an experienced bibliographer. To help the reader, two roadmaps are provided.

The first roadmap, Appendix M 1, charts the Preliminaries. In the original they are not paginated, and as indicated above do not always occur in the same order. The first page of *The Tempest* is included in the table to anchor the last page of the preliminaries. Column 1 gives the through-pagination from the *Norton Facsimile*. Because I have shifted the position of what is now designated $[A5+1:2]$, this pagination is not sequential. Column 2 shows the pages that are signed in the original. Column 3 gives the reference notation for each page. Column 4 indicates blank pages and pages with text; for the latter, to aid identification, the beginning of the text is quoted in each case.

The second roadmap, Appendix M 2, covers the Text. Column 1 gives the through-pagination from the *Norton Facsimile*. Column 2 shows both the headings for the three sections of the book (Comedies, Histories, Tragedies) and the titles of individual plays. Column 3 gives the signatures (that is, of an ‘ideal’ copy; there are misprints in the signatures). Column 4 presents the original’s pagination; this is in three series, one each for the Comedies, Histories and Tragedies. There are numerous errors and seventeen known variants in the pagination. The principal anomalies and blank pages are shown in column 5. It must always be borne in mind that any one copy will exhibit its own unique combination of variations.

C MEASUREMENTS

The descriptions include two measurements—in millimetres. The measurements are to the nearest millimetre. One can compare how Lee took his measurements by referring to his questionnaire, page 3, item V, in Chapter 4, Appendix S 1.

The first measurement, which is the first item under ‘Text’, is of the overall size of the leaf, and is given thus: ‘326 x 213 mm’. For this measurement, A1 is normally used. The apparent precision of the measurement must be interpreted with much caution, especially the horizontal measure. This is taken on the top- or bottom-edge, from the centre of the

---

10 Developed from Greg, *First Folio*, 437-38.
fore-edge to the point where the paper meets the binding (usually the head or tail band or, if it is exposed, the back-edge of the paper). Variation can occur if the fore-edge is concave and/or untrimmed; it can also occur according to the nature of the binding. It is possible to state what an original bifolium sheet actually measured. When Folger 49 was dismantled for the 1991 Folger First Folio Exhibition, Peter Blayney measured the gutter margin to the inner rule of several quires of its leaves, taking an average of the dimensions at the top and bottom of each sheet; he then measured in Folger 1, which is hardly trimmed with most of the deckle edge remaining, from the same rule to the fore-edge. With the two measurements added together, the total width of a bifolium turned out to be 444.5 mm. Thus the maximum width of a leaf, including the portion sewn into the binding, is 222.25 mm. Allowing for this obscured portion, one can use this figure as a standard to estimate the degree to which the fore-edges of copies have been trimmed.

The vertical measure is taken above, i.e., centred on, the rule which separates the columns. The vertical measure is more exact, though a leaf can vary in height from fore-edge to back-edge, and there may be variation in the size of the leaves throughout the volume. Of course, if the top- and bottom-edges of the volume were trimmed at the last binding, the vertical measure is likely to be exact throughout, save for exceptionally short leaves. Where the size of one or a few leaves varies significantly from the norm in a volume, this is generally noted.

The second measurement, which is the first or second item under ‘Binding’, is of the binding, thus: ‘338 x 223 mm’. The vertical measure can be taken to be exact. The horizontal measure is approximate. It is normally taken from the fore-edge of the binding to the line where the binding hinges—the joint—thus omitting the curvature of the spine and the raised bands (if any) on the spine.\footnote{When I began to describe Folios, I took the horizontal measurement including, by eye, the curvature of the spine. The descriptions of the Japanese copies in Chapter 3 contain this measurement.}

D THE MODEL

The term ‘model’, referring to the form into which it is anticipated the descriptions of all First Folios will fit, is a convenient single word to embrace: subjects covered; overall organisation of a description; and the titles, scope, content and formats of the parts which make up a description. The model has been developed with a view to ensuring that the descriptions meet the needs of bibliographers, textual scholars, historians of the book, librarians and book-collectors. Two subjects are privileged—the text and provenance. The intention is to mention everything which affects the text and to include, or if more appropriate make reference to, all available information concerning provenance. The
design of the model takes primary account of the user's needs. At the same time it has to be able to accept the varying types and amounts of information that copies with vastly different histories offer. It has evolved over nearly a decade; it may need to evolve further if it is to fulfil the vision of accommodating the descriptions of all extant First Folios.

Folios presenting as wide a range of descriptive problems as possible have been consulted in an attempt to perfect the model. For example, among the UK copies described in Chapter 3, there are perhaps as many as six with all text leaves (Sir John Soane, the two copies in Senate House, Dr Williams, one or maybe two of the copies in Stratford), two which are relatively unfurnished and in poor condition (Dulwich College and the Wheler copy in Stratford) and one unfurnished copy in good condition (Dr Williams). In the process of developing the model, I have leafed through the following Folios: in the UK, the nine copies described in Chapter 3, the copies at Oriel College, Queen's College and Wadham College, Oxford, and the copy in Winchester; in Ireland, the copy in Dublin; in the USA, Folger 80-82 (described in Chapter 5), one of the copies at Harvard (West 150), one of the copies in Ohio (West 174), the two copies in the Sutro Library in San Francisco and two of the copies in the Huntington (West 52 and 53); and in Japan, Meisei 1, 6, 7, 10 and 11, described in Chapter 3. Many other copies, though not leafed through, have been examined, including others at the Folger and all at Meisei University.

In outline, the model looks as follows:
## Table A
Model for Describing First Folios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Heading of Copy Description:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West and Lee reference numbers (and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Folger or Meisei numbers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owner (or keeper) and address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>General and Special Comments (including a summary comment on condition of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Collation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Press-variants and States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provenance:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining sections of this chapter describe the scope and content of each element of the model.

Items appearing in the descriptions between angled brackets < > are quotations from the entry for the same copy in Lee's *Census*.

## E HEADING OF COPY DESCRIPTION

Each copy has a new reference number taken from the new Census in Chapter 7, and conspicuously presented in the margin. Lee’s copy number together with his class assignment follow in square brackets, thus: ‘[Lee 57-Class IIB]’. For ease of reading, especially of the higher numbers, arabic numerals replace Lee’s roman numerals. The complete headings, including definitions, of Lee’s classes are given in full in Chapter 6,
Section A, below. He describes how he assigned copies to his classes on the first page of his *Census* (19).

If a volume is not in Lee, it is noted thus: '[Non-Lee]'. If it is not known whether a copy is or is not one of those in Lee, it is labelled '[Non-Lee?]'. If the volume is one of the fourteen copies numbered and described in Lee, 1906, it is referred to as follows: 'Lee+', followed by the appropriate number, eg: '[Lee+1]'. If the volume is first mentioned by Lee in his 1924 article, the cue-title is given followed by the page number: '[Lee, 1924, 101]'. For Folger and Meisei copies, their copy number appears. The owner's (or keeper's) name and address follow the copy reference numbers—for the first copy only if there is more than one at the same location.

**F GENERAL AND SPECIAL COMMENTS**

This section is a quick introduction to the copy. Its coverage varies according to the characteristics of the copy. It gives *selected* key points—eg, an overall comment on the condition of the text, something notable in the copy's history, a famous earlier owner, marginalia of interest, the fact that the copy is part of a set of the four seventeenth-century Folios. It might pull out generalisations from the minutiae of the description. It can help a reader to identify a particular volume or to find a volume with a particular characteristic (eg, unimpaired text, complete text). It concludes with a count of original leaves, both preliminary and text.

**G COLLATION**

**Preliminaries** The end-papers and binder’s leaves, which appear before \( A1 \) and after \( 3b6 \), are all of course supplied by the binder, and in terms of the make-up of a volume could logically be covered under ‘Binding’. However, for ease of reference, they are treated as follows.

First, they are referred to by small roman numerals in square brackets (assuming they are unpaged), thus: ‘[i], [ii], [iii]’, etc. The recto of [i]—the lining-paper—can be assumed...
to be pasted to the inner cover of the binding, its verso forming the left half of the first opening. For those at the end, the numbering runs on. Thus, when an end-paper and two binder's leaves at the beginning of the volume are matched by two binder's leaves and an end-paper at the end, the latter are referred to as '[iv], [v], [vi]'. The verso of the last--the lining-paper--can be assumed to be pasted to the binding.

Second, their number and presence are indicated under 'Collation', where one might expect to find them. Those at the beginning of the volume precede the treatment of the original preliminaries, while those at the end conclude the 'Text' subsection. Occasionally, additional information is included if it best fits here, or if it self-evidently belongs here--eg, a title-page pasted to a binder's leaf. Third, as a rule, information contained on binder's leaves is covered under 'Provenance' (see below).

Regarding the nine original preliminaries: normally, mention is given to each of these, using the standard reference notation, with the intention not only of showing their presence (or absence), but also the order in which they appear. The entry πA1-6 would indicate that all nine preliminaries are present and that they are in the order shown in Appendix A. Normally the state of the portrait is given.\(^\text{13}\)

**Text** This section covers the plays: ie, leaves A1 to 3b6. The first item to appear here is the measurement of the leaves (see Section C, 'Measurements', above). As mentioned earlier, a prime consideration is the text. The intention is to record where and how the text is affected: the absence (or presence) of leaves is noted; pages replaced in facsimile are noted; damage and repairs are noted, either in general terms, or--where the text is affected--by specific reference. If the text is extensively damaged, specific reference gives way to a general statement. Marginalia are noted or recorded; sometimes they shed light on provenance. Comments are presented in page order. Depending on what they have to cover, they are given either in one sequence through the volume, or under appropriate headings. When reference to given lines is required, the through-line-numbering by play in the Norton Facsimile is used. Binder's leaves and end-papers are noted at the end of this section (as indicated in 'Preliminaries' above).

**H STATE OF PRESS-VARIANTS**

My original plan did not call for including press-variants in the descriptions in Chapter 3, on the grounds that doing so would stretch the scope of this work too far. However, the

---

\(^{13}\) For information on the title-page and the portrait, see M H Spielmann, *The Title-Page of the First Folio of Shakespeare's Plays* (1924); Arthur M Hind, *Engraving in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, 3 parts (Cambridge, 1952-64), Part 2 (1952), 354-59; Hinman, I, plates: frontispiece, and opposite pp 248 and 249; and Blayney, illustrations: pp 19 and 38-39.
model was always intended ultimately to include variants and a number of scholars have urged me to demonstrate their inclusion in the descriptions which follow. The question is 'which variants?' Hinman found over 500, but as Peter Blayney has pointed out, Hinman, having spent years discovering that few of them would be of any value to textual scholars, 'understandably tended to exaggerate both the amount and the significance of the variation he had found'. Over a hundred are 'variations of inking alone' and most of the deliberate corrections have no textual significance. The criterion for inclusion which I use, following Blayney, is what 'might conceivably affect editorial procedure. . . . For a variant to matter to an editor, the uncorrected reading must contain potentially useful information not found elsewhere (in the corrected state, or in an earlier edition)'; Blayney's count is 'at most five such variants'. These are shown in Appendix M3. The variant reading and the state of each variant is recorded in those descriptions in Chapter 3 which have been made, or revised, since I decided to include press-variants.

I PROVENANCE

All available information concerning a volume's succession of owners, sales dates and prices, and other history is given. Everything in Lee concerning provenance is included. As indicated above, quotations from his Census appear within angled brackets, < >. Frequently, this information has not been verified; or is not verifiable, because Lee gave no source. This section has four subsections as follows, though not all four are always present.

Data This first subsection presents provenance information found on the end-papers and binder's leaves. It normally also notes documents attached to these leaves. The information is presented in the order in which it appears in the volume and the items are identified by the sign of the leaf on which they appear or by arabic numerals in sequence.

Arbitrarily, this subsection normally contains only information from the end-papers and binder's leaves. There are three rationales for this. First, usually, most provenance information (such as bookplates, names of owners, and records of sale) appears here.

---

14 'Collation and Variants', 2.
16 Ibid, xxxii.
17 For phase 2 of the current project—the goal of which is to describe all extant First Folios, funding permitting—the model may include a more comprehensive list of variants, namely those resulting from deliberate action and from accidents resulting in changes of reading. Using these criteria, there are over one hundred variants (Blayney, 'Collation and Variants', 2-10).
18 For the copies described in Chapter 3, I have checked the responses to the questionnaires Lee sent to owners when he was preparing his Census. (These are preserved, with the reference number ER 85/6/1, in the Sir Sidney Lee Collection at the Records Office, Shakespeare Centre, Stratford-upon-Avon, which is described in a note to Section A of Chapter 4 below.)
Second, strictly speaking these leaves themselves belong to a volume’s provenance since they are part of the volume’s history after it left the printer (though this argument could apply equally to the binding). Third, provenance information appearing on original leaves usually fits logically in the ‘Collation’ section. Sometimes, to keep data together, a cross-reference is made in ‘Collation’ and the data is placed here.

**Addenda** This refers to loose papers which are associated with a particular copy. They may be written by someone who is uniquely informed (such as an owner), or by an expert (such as the writer of the technical ‘Conservation Note’ in the Trinity College, Dublin, copy). They often contain valuable information on provenance, as well as on other subjects such as binding or repairs. A summary of their content is included in this subsection if it has bibliographical significance or interest. They are normally presented in chronological order. If the subsection does not appear, it can be assumed that there are no addenda of significance.

**Owners** The third subsection lists owners in chronological order. If there is more than one owner, the owners are numbered in bold ‘(1)’, ‘(2)’, etc, in chronological order, as far as this can be established. Booksellers are usually shown as a separate owner, without necessarily implying a distinction between ‘acting on his own behalf’ and ‘acting as an agent’. Often a new owner will occur within angled brackets, < > (ie, within an unverified quotation from Lee)—in which case, according to my convention, his/her number appears within square brackets, [ ].

To find the evidence of ownership and chronology, the first places to look are in the two preceding subsections, ‘Data’ and ‘Addenda’. Additional information may be noted elsewhere, such as in ‘Collation’. To avoid clutter, cross-references to these sources are not given unless they seem particularly called for.

**References** The logic for including ‘References’ under ‘Provenance’ is that they, or rather their content, are part of the volume’s history. This subsection, with no attempt at completeness, may note where the volume in question has been mentioned, discussed, sold or exhibited. Occasionally one finds a formal description of an individual copy, as for example of the Cologne copy.\(^{19}\)

---

\(^{19}\) Wolfgang Weiss, *Das Kölner Exemplar von Shakespeares First Folio* (1923) (Krefeld, 1973).
**J BINDING**

If the binding has a protection, it is shown thus: eg, '(Boxed)', as the first item in the 'Binding' section. Obviously, the fact that a volume is boxed or has some similar protection, and the fact that an owner has taken the trouble to protect the volume, increase the likelihood of the volume's staying in substantially the same condition as described here. The measurement of the binding is given in millimetres (see Section C, 'Measurements', above).

The entry normally covers all of the following that is known: colour, material, binder, date, condition, decoration, and treatment of the edges and of the first and last openings (the lining-papers and the free end-papers). When a number of 'panels' on the spine is mentioned it can be assumed that the volume has that number, less one, of raised bands.

Since the present work is intended to meet the needs, in particular, of the bibliographical or literary scholar, the descriptions of bindings are brief. Exceptions to this guideline, as appropriate, are pre-1850 (ie, before the great rash of re-binding) and notable bindings.

**K OTHER**

If needed, this section is added to capture information, unique to the volume in question, which does not fit happily in one of the preceding sections.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NORTON PAGINATION</th>
<th>PRINTED SIGNATURE</th>
<th>REFERENCE NOTATION</th>
<th>PAGE IDENTIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>πA1f</td>
<td>[Blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>πA1v</td>
<td>To the Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[=Ben Jonson's verse]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>πA1+1f</td>
<td>[Title-page, with portrait]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>πA2f</td>
<td>TO THE MOST NOBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[=Start of Dedication]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>πA2v</td>
<td>The Epistle Dedicatone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[=End of Dedication]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>πA3f</td>
<td>To the great Variety of Readers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>πA3v</td>
<td>[Blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>πA4f</td>
<td>To the memory of my beloved,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[=Start of Ben Jonson's verse]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>πA4v</td>
<td>[=End of Ben Jonson's verse]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>πA5f</td>
<td>Vpon the Lines and Life of the Famous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[=Hugh Holland's verse]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[12]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>πA5v</td>
<td>[Blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>πA5+1f</td>
<td>TO THE MEMORIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[=Verses of L. Digges and I. M.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>πA5+1v</td>
<td>[Blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>πA5+2f</td>
<td>The Workes of William Shakespeare . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Names of the Principall Actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[18]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>πA5+2v</td>
<td>[Blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>πA6f</td>
<td>A CATALOGUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[14]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>πA6v</td>
<td>[Blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A1f</td>
<td>THE TEMPEST.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The preliminaries are presented in the order described in Section A above. Because this differs from the order in Norton Facsimile, 1968, and the order is unchanged in Norton Facsimile, 1996, the page numbers in column 1 are not sequential.
## Appendix M 2

### CROSS-REFERENCE TABLE

#### THE TEXT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norton Through-Pagination</th>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Signatures</th>
<th>First Folio Pagination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three Series</td>
<td>Blank Leaves &amp; Pagination Anomalies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norton Through-Pagination</th>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Signatures</th>
<th>First Folio Pagination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three Series</td>
<td>Blank Leaves &amp; Pagination Anomalies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 19-321 | COMEDIES | A1r-B4r | 1-303 |
| 19-37  | The Tempest | B4v-D1v | 1-19 |
| 38-56  | Two Gentlemen | D2r-E6v | 20-38 |
| 57-78  | Merry Wives | E6v-G6v | 39-60 |
| 79-102 | Measure for Measure | F1v-G6v | 61-84 |
| 103-118 | Comedy of Errors | H1r-J2v | 85-100 |
| 119-139 | Much Ado | I3r-L1v | 101-121 |
| 140-162 | Love's Labour's | L1v-M6v | 122-144 |
| 163-180 | Midsummer Night's Dream | N1r-O3v | 145-162 |
| 181-202 | Merchant of Venice | O4v-Q2v | 163-184 |
| 203-225 | As You Like It | Q3r-S2r | 185-207 |
| 226-247 | Taming of the Shrew | S2v-V1r | 208-229 |
| 248-272 | All's Well | V1v-Y1v | 230-254 |
| 273-293 | Twelfth Night | Y2r-Z6v | 255-275 |
| 294-321 | Winter's Tale | Aa1r-Cc2r | 277-303 |
| 323-586 | HISTORIES | E1r-F1r | 1-232 |
| 323-344 | King John | a1r-b5v | 1-22 |
| 345-367 | Richard II | b6v-d5r | 23-45 |
| 368-393 | 1 Henry IV | d5v-f6r | 46-73 |

Omitting 47-48
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>394-422</td>
<td>2 Henry IV</td>
<td>f6v-g6v, xgg1r-8v</td>
<td>74-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423-449</td>
<td>Henry V</td>
<td>h1r-k2v</td>
<td>69-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450-473</td>
<td>1 Henry VI</td>
<td>k2v-m2v</td>
<td>96-119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474-500</td>
<td>2 Henry VI</td>
<td>m2v-q3v</td>
<td>120-146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-526</td>
<td>3 Henry VI</td>
<td>o4v-q4v</td>
<td>147-172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527-558</td>
<td>Richard III</td>
<td>q5v-t2v</td>
<td>173-204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559-586</td>
<td>Henry VIII</td>
<td>g3v-x4v</td>
<td>205-232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587-907</td>
<td>TRAGEDIES</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587-615</td>
<td>Troilus &amp; Cressida</td>
<td>'gg3r' ('xgg3'), 1f4g6v, 2g2r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617-646</td>
<td>Coriolanus</td>
<td>aa1r-cc3v</td>
<td>1-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>647-668</td>
<td>Titus Andronicus</td>
<td>cc4v-ce2v</td>
<td>31-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>669-693</td>
<td>Romeo and Juliet</td>
<td>ce3r-gg2v, Gg1r</td>
<td>53-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>694-715</td>
<td>Timon of Athens</td>
<td>Gg1v-6v, hh1r-6r</td>
<td>80-98 + one unpaged (= Norton [716])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>717-738</td>
<td>Julius Caesar</td>
<td>kk1r-li5v</td>
<td>109-130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>739-759</td>
<td>Macbeth</td>
<td>ll6r-nn4r</td>
<td>131-151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760-790</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>nn4v-qq1v</td>
<td>152-282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>791-817</td>
<td>King Lear</td>
<td>qq2r-ss3r</td>
<td>283-309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>818-847</td>
<td>Othello</td>
<td>ss3v-vv6v</td>
<td>310-339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>848-876</td>
<td>Antony &amp; Cleopatra</td>
<td>vv6v-zz2v</td>
<td>340-368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>877-907</td>
<td>Cymbeline</td>
<td>zz3r-3b6v</td>
<td>369-399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix M 3

LIST OF PRESS-VARIANTS

The following table lists the five press-variants described in the text and gives cross-references for finding them. The first column is for use with the *Norton Facsimile*, the second with a First Folio. The third gives the signature. In the variant column, the corrected state—state 2—follows the uncorrected. Both the uncorrected and corrected versions of C4¹ and vv3¹ are reproduced in Appendix A of the *Norton Facsimile*. The uncorrected state of the latter, from Folger 47, is marked for correction by the proof-reader.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE B</th>
<th>Cross-References to Variants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norton Facsimile: page and line</td>
<td>First Folio: page and position on page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Gentlemen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>page 49 line 1383</td>
<td>page 31 col a, 1/3 down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>line 1395</td>
<td>col a, 1/2 down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>line 1459</td>
<td>col b, 1/2 down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othello</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>page 840 line 2823</td>
<td>page 332 col a, 11 lines up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>page 841 line 3011</td>
<td>page 333 col b, 1/4 up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Blayney comments on these variants as follows: 'The first of those changes may be an officious interference with a characteristically Shakespearean construction ("Here followes her vices"), and the third is as likely to be a sophistication as a correction. The second and fourth are probably genuine corrections, although in each case the earlier reading is serviceable enough—and while the uncorrected state of the fifth variant hardly provides a direct clue to the needed emendation, it does at least corroborate an editor's suspicion that "singing" is wrong and that Q2's "sighing" is probably right'.

22 Ibid.
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Bibliographical Descriptions of Selected First Folios
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A UNITED KINGDOM

London

West 18 Dulwich College
West 20 Reform Club
West 21 Sir John Soane's Museum
West 22 Senate House (Sterling)
West 23 Senate House (Durning-Lawrence)

Stratford

West 27 Dr Williams's Library
West 37 Shakespeare Centre (Ashburnham)
West 38 Shakespeare Centre (Wheler)
West 39 Shakespeare Centre (Theatre)

B JAPAN

Kobe

West 198 Konan Women's University

Kyoto

West 199 Foreign Studies University

Tokyo

West 200 Meisei University 1
West 201 Meisei University 2
West 202 Meisei University 3
West 203 Meisei University 4
West 204 Meisei University 5
West 205 Meisei University 6
West 206 Meisei University 7
West 207 Meisei University 8
West 208 Meisei University 9
West 209 Meisei University 10
West 210 Meisei University 11
West 211 Meisei University 12
West 212 Kamijo Family

TABLE A Meisei University Copies
INTRODUCTION

This chapter contains the bibliographical descriptions of a selection of individual copies of the First Folio. The descriptions appear in the order of the corresponding copies in the Census in Chapter 7 below.

They are presented in two sections: Section A, copies in the United Kingdom; Section B, copies in Japan. The copies described in the two sections have in common that they were primarily selected with a view to developing, testing and demonstrating the model presented in the preceding chapter, but the two sets of descriptions differ in several ways. First, in their reliability: for gathering data to describe copies, I established two guiding principles: look at each page of a copy and leaf through each copy (at least) twice in order to check accuracy. I was able to follow these principles only with the UK copies. Time was very limited in Japan; some copies I was able to leaf through only once, others not at all. (This is noted in each case.) Accordingly, the descriptions in Section B are less reliable and in some cases less thorough, though for two copies (Meisei 8 and 9) this is offset by my having been able to borrow from descriptions made by Peter Blayney before the copies went to Japan. Second, in the treatment of press-variants: there is a section recording the chosen variants in all the descriptions of the UK copies. When I examined the Japanese copies, as mentioned in Chapter 2, I had not decided to include variants. This section is therefore not present in the descriptions in Section B.

The two sections differ in two other ways. First, in the accessibility of their copies to persons in the West: while one of the criteria of selection for the UK copies was accessibility, for the Japanese copies it was inaccessibility. It is not easy for most people in the West to visit Japan and to travel between Tokyo, Kyoto and Kobe. Accordingly, it seemed important to include the information on the Japanese copies even if hastily researched. This is especially so since the information is not available elsewhere. This led to the final difference: while the copies in Section A are a selection of the copies in the UK, the copies in Section B are all the copies I know of in Japan. Because of their inaccessibility and because very few people are aware that there are as many as fifteen First Folios in Japan, it seemed desirable to include them all. For the sake of completeness, Section B contains two copies which I did not see. Meisei 12 was purchased after I was in Japan; access to the Kamijo copy was proscribed by the terms of a will. Regarding the Japanese descriptions, I echo the words of Henrietta Bartlett in her Introduction to the Census of Shakespeare quartos: 'No one is better aware than the present editor of the mistakes and omissions in these descriptions, but it has seemed best to give all available information even if the entries lack uniformity'.

---

1 Henrietta C Bartlett and Alfred W Pollard, A Census of Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto 1594-1709 (1916; rev 1939), iv.
In order to understand the structure and content of the descriptions which follow, the reader is referred to the preceding chapter.

A. COPIES IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

LONDON

[Lee 141, Class IIIB] DULWICH COLLEGE LIBRARY, London SE21 7LD

GENERAL AND SPECIAL COMMENTS Bound in two volumes: Comedies (with nine of the fourteen plays present—The Tempest, Two Gentlemen (except D1), Measure for Measure, Much Ado, Love's Labours Lost, Merchant of Venice, As You Like it, Taming of the Shrew and All's Well (except Y1) and Histories (with all of the ten plays present plus six leaves of Romeo and Juliet). There are no Tragedies. The lacunae in the Comedies volume are mostly whole plays. There appears to be no evidence to explain the absence of whole plays (as opposed to random leaves) in the comedies, nor the absence of all the Tragedies.

The condition of most of the surviving leaves is good. The text is clean and clear. The few marginalia and occasional marks do not obscure it. The paper is crisp. There is some staining in volume 1 and staining throughout volume 2, severe at the beginning. A few leaves are damaged; some of these are rather crudely repaired, usually with small patches. Most likely the repairs were made at the time of binding with no attempt at refurbishment since. The margins are small, though the rules are never cropped. Original leaves present: three preliminaries and 235 text.

COLLATION: Volume 1: Preliminaries: [i-ii] A6 Added above Coriolanus in MS ink, presumably before the Tragedies were separated: 'Troilus & Cressida'. The leaf, which has other ink marks, is damaged, mounted and has a new fore-edge. A5+1 is repaired with two patches. A5+2 is also repaired with two patches, and additionally has a tear at the foot repaired with a patch and an unrepaired tear on the fore-edge. The rest of the preliminaries are missing.

Text: 313 x c. 204 mm. Leaves present: A1-C6, F1-G6, I3-M6, O4-X6. [iii-iv] blank. Comments on the text leaves are grouped under two headings.

Leaves with text affected: A2 Damage to fore-edge and bottom fore-corner, just touching the 'h' of the catchword. B4 Bottom fore-corner gone, touching catchword (recto) and taking letters from l. 45 and first words in ll. 46-49. F3 Top fore-corner

---

2 Dr Jan Piggott, Archivist, Dulwich College, kindly read this description; he endorsed my conclusions 'about the Library and dates' in the 'Provenance' section (letter, 25 February 1998).

3 If someone was purloining whole plays, it is not obvious why he additionally took D1 and Y1, since the missing plays which follow these leaves each begin on a recto (respectively on D2 and Y2).
gone (including page number) and fore-edge damaged, not removing text; l. 568 blot obscures 'ose' of 'purpose'. F4 Top fore-corner gone (including page number) and fore-edge damaged, taking words at ends of ll. 793 and 797 and beginning of ll. 859-65, and letters from ll. 877-80 and 882. F6 Piece of bottom margin missing, taking beginning of l. 1371, last word of l. 1437 and first word of l. 1503. G2 Tiny blot touching letters in l. 2009. I4 Foot of fore-edge damaged; tiny burn hole taking letters from 'therefore' (l. 374); tear through beginning of l. 401. M4 Tear through ll. 2263-68 and 2328-36, repaired with two small patches, one of which obscures 'se now' at end of l. 2269.

Quire Q has suffered more than most. Q1 Bottom fore-corner missing, taking ends of ll. 2392 and 2394 and catchword, and beginning of l. 2452. Q2 Small burn hole taking letters from ll. 2595-96 and 2661. Q3 Damaged fore-edge taking ends of ll. 57-59 and 85-86, touching end of l. 84 and beginnings of ll. 123-25 and 150-53, and touching end of l. 154; tear at end of l. 71 and beginning of l. 137. Q4 Fore-margin severely damaged: in particular, piece missing taking ends of ll. 336-41 and 343, and the beginnings of lines 401-08; and tear through outer column, crudely repaired by a patch obscuring letters at ends of ll. 324 and 328. Small tear affecting letters in l. 354 and first letters of l. 420. T2 Small burn hole taking letters in ll. 1403-04 and 1579. T3 Small burn hole taking letters in ll. 1751-52 and 1817. X5 Pagination corrected in ink.

Leaves with damage, but with no loss or obscuring of text (including some with tears through text): A1, A3-B1, F1 (dark stain, top inner corner, continuing and diminishing on following leaves), I3, O5, M5, Q5-6.

Volume 2: [i-ii]. Leaves present: al-x4, ee3-ff2. [iii-iv] blank. Almost all the leaves in volume 2 suffer from water (?) staining, especially at the beginning (a1-b5). Also throughout the volume, there are small holes in the gutter margin, not affecting the text.

Leaves with text affected: a1 Large piece of bottom fore-corner missing, taking the ends of lines from l. 86 increasingly to the foot, and the beginnings of lines from l. 150 increasingly to the foot. a4 Early MS (ink) in top margin: 'The life & death of [?] John [?] Wooxs / King John' (the first line cropped). Another MS mark in column a. a5 Piece missing from fore-edge taking end of 'right' in l. 1113 and beginnings of ll. 1179-87. e3 Bottom fore-corner: creasing of paper before printing has affected bottom eleven lines (recto) and twelve lines (verso). gg3 Pagination corrected. k6 MS: 'Enter J P [?] Superville G[____?] and a Witch'. 13v Damaged fore-corner touching first letters in bottom five lines. m1 Two tiny blots obscuring two letters. m5 MS: '[?] Robin Hood'. o1 Bottom fore-corner missing, taking ends of l. 2781 and catchword, and beginnings of ll. 2842-44. q2 Bottom fore-corner: fold in paper slightly affects text in bottom eleven lines (recto) and fourteen lines (verso). q4 Repaired upper half of fore-margin, with loss of letters at ends of ll. 3091-92 (recto)
and beginnings of most lines on verso. q6 Unrepaired hole and tear near foot, touching bottom line in column a (recto) and in column b (verso). t6 Wear and small hole taking or affecting letters in ll. 753, 815-17, 942-44.

x1-4 All have damaged bottom fore-corners. x1 Loss of ends of ll. 2633-37 and catchword, and tear through bottom line of inner column. x2 Piece missing in bottom margin, touching last line of column a (recto) and last line of column b (verso). Recto: black marks, and verso: blots--neither obscuring text. x3 Fore-margin: several small tears, two touching text on verso. x4 Loss of catchword and of letters at ends of ll. 3395 and 3398.

Leaves with damage, but with no loss or obscuring of text (including some with tears through text): c3, f1-2, h5, l4, q3, r4, t2, and ff2.

PRESS-VARIANTS AND STATES

Two Gentlemen

Othello

C4f, l. 1383 ‘follow’ (state 2).

l. 1395 ‘villaine’ (state 2).

l. 1459 ‘grievously’ (state 2).


(3) <Possibly acquired in 17th century>. Lee gives no source for this statement. (4) Dulwich College was founded in 1619 by Edward Alleyn--actor, builder of the Fortune Theatre with Philip Henslowe, son-in-law of John Donne and benefactor. He bequeathed his library to the College, but the Folio is not mentioned in any of his documents. Writing about Edward Alleyn’s books, J R Piggott (present Archivist) said: ‘We cannot be sure that the two volumes . . . in the College belonged to Alleyn’.4 (5) Writing the history of Dulwich College (1889), William Young said: ‘It would be interesting to know how and when the first folio of Shakespeare came into the possession of the College, but the strong probability is that it formed part of the

---

4 ‘Edward Alleyn’s Books’ in Edward Alleyn: Elizabethan Actor, Jacobean Gentleman (Dulwich Picture Gallery, [1994]), 63-65 (64).
Cartwright Collection. The bequest of William Cartwright, including his books, was received in 1687.

(6) The Library has no information concerning accession. The first record of the volume’s presence in the Library is in a manuscript ‘Catalogus’ started by James Hume in 1729 and continued by Richard King (at Dulwich College 1733-38) in 1733. An early entry of King’s, under the heading ‘F. vi.’ (the shelf-mark), reads: ‘5. Two old play books of Shakespear’. (The ‘5’ could tie in with the ‘5’ in the shelf-mark on πA6 and a1—see above, Data (1 and 2). There is a marginal pencil note: ‘? the folio’.) There is no record of any other books fitting this description. The fact that the date of publication is absent makes this entry an exception and suggests that the title-page was missing at this time. The ‘Catalogus’ is stated to be ‘very inaccurate’ and it is possible that Hume omitted the volume. If he did not, then it must have been acquired after 1729 and around 1733. The shelf-marks may support this, as the former Librarian wrote: ‘From shelf-marks [the volumes] would appear to have been in the library since the early 18th century at least’, though the ‘at least’ leaves open the possibility of earlier acquisition.

Owners: Dulwich College is the only documented owner. The two volumes were certainly in the College Library by about 1733. Without more evidence, one could only speculate that either Edward Alleyn or William Cartwright was the owner before making the gift to the College.

BINDING 318 x 209 mm. The two volumes are bound in the same style: leather back and corners, marbled boards. There is no information on how or when the volumes came to be separately bound. From the style, apparently eighteenth century. The spines do not have raised bands, but panels are created with blind tooling. Second panel down (both volumes): ‘Shakspeare’ (sic)—gilt. Fronts and backs scuffed, especially volume 1; all corners are worn. Spines breaking; the front cover and [i] are separated from volume 1.

GENERAL AND SPECIAL COMMENTS A deprived copy. Missing are most of the preliminaries; all of Merry Wives, Comedy of Errors, As You Like It, and Taming of the Shrew; and leaves of The Tempest (B1), Two Gentlemen (D1),

---

5 The History of Dulwich College, 2 vols (1889), ii, 321.
6 This Cartwright was the son of William Cartwright who in November 1623 wrote the supposed letter to Edward Alleyn, his friend, about having ‘paid a sover-in for Shaksper’s booke of Plaies’. The letter is discussed above in Chapter 1, Section B.
7 In a manuscript note (mounted on an end-paper at the front of the volume), dated 31 December 1857, by Charles Howes, Librarian 1841-57.
Merchant of Venice (Q1-2), All’s Well (V1), Henry VIII (t3-4), Troilus & Cressida (‘gg3’), Antony & Cleopatra (x1-6) and Cymbeline (3a2, 3a5, 3b2 and 3b5-6). Missing leaves throughout are replaced with blank modern leaves.

Except where noted below, the text is clean and in very good condition. Almost no marginalia or markings. Tears and damaged margins are repaired; these are mostly at the beginning and end of the volume. Some margins are closely trimmed. The paper is not limp, but is dull. The volume possibly has a continuous provenance since the seventeenth century. Original leaves present: two preliminaries and 385 text, including five very damaged leaves (A1, A6, 3b1 and 3b3-4).


Text: Some leaves remargined. There are pencilled numbers in sequence on the bottom inner corners at the end and beginning of sections of original leaves, as a guide to the binder. All original leaves in three sequences—K4-Y4, s3-v2 and ‘gg3’—have brown stains at the foot, increasing in size then diminishing through the sequence—not obscuring the text.

A1 Inlaid and severely damaged, with inner bottom corner and outer margin missing, taking much text. A2-4 Staining and minor damage (repaired), not obscuring the text. A5 Text partly lost in last three lines of outer column, recto and verso. A6 Top outer portion missing, with loss of nearly half the text in outer column to half-way down the leaf. B1 Missing. B2 MS in pencil at top, touching the text. B3 A mark touching words in ll. 2066-68 and 2264-65. C5 Box rule at foot of outer margin slightly trimmed. D1-E6 Missing. F1-3 Small stains, but not obscuring the text. H1-I2 Missing. K2 Small burn, removing first two letters of ‘raine’ (1.1432). Q1-V1 missing. X3° Pencilled MS not touching text. X4 Black mark affecting letters in ll. 2191-92. Y5 Top outer corner, mark and stain touching but not obscuring text, recto and verso. Z5 Top and fore-margins closely trimmed. Repaired outer margin at foot of the leaf, taking letters or words from the ends of ll. 2356-69 and the beginnings of ll. 2419-36. Z6° The blank page is covered with light pencil—mostly scrolls.

b4 Tiny burn taking letters in ll. 2304 and 2492. b5 Tiny burn hole, touching letters in ll. 2665-66. d6° Stain through leaf, mostly affecting the beginnings of ll. 259-63. f4° Tiny burn hole taking letters in l. 2657. gg3° Bottom margin, MS (ink) in an early hand. k2° MS (ink) figures in pounds, shillings and pence, including three

9 For the New Shakespere Society, see Chapter 1, Section E, above.
sums—not affecting the text. k3f, k4r-v and k5v MS (ink) in spaces beside four stage directions. k4 Tiny burn hole taking letters from l. 388. 11 Small repair to bottom margin touching 'unaccustom'd' on verso. 15 Small tear (repaired) at bottom fore-corner distorting letters at beginnings of ll. 213-17. p1 Repaired tear through ll. 756-60 and 953-55, not obscuring the text. q6f and r3f Inconspicuous MS pencil, including on r3: '[?]-[?] Weston 1774'. s4 Repaired hole obscuring letters in ll. 2722-24 and 2909-10. t2 Top of fore-margin closely trimmed, taking some of the box rule. v6 Tiny hole taking two letters from 'that' (l. 2357).

'gg4' Missing. jj5 Mark obscuring colon (l. 3086) and letters at beginning of l. 3152. aa5 Tiny burn hole, taking parts of letters in ll. 1066-67. aa6 Folds in paper and repair to fore-margin affect the top twelve lines (recto) and fifteen (verso), taking the ends of ll. 1321-22 and the beginnings of ll. 1385-87 and 1389, as well as part of the box rule. dd2 Tiny burn hole takes first letter of 'Sonnes' (l. 1068) and tiny blot obscures three letters in 'Ornaments' (l. 1091). dd6-ee2 Fore-margins closely trimmed, taking some of the box rule at the top. ee2 Small hole taking letters from 'wherein' (l. 2633). ee3-4 Missing. ee5 Centre of fore-margin, piece missing (repaired), taking ends of ll. 578-96 and beginnings of ll. 644-64. ff1-5 Fore-margin closely trimmed, taking box rule at the top. gg2 Centre of fore-margin, piece missing (repaired), taking ends of ll. 188 and 191, and beginnings of ll. 253-63. gg4 Bottom fore-corner repaired, touching catchword and l. 796. II2 Tiny burn mark obscuring 'do' (l. 1856). Repaired fore-margin touches ends of some lines on recto and takes letters from the beginnings of lines in top half of page. pp3 Repair to fore-corner; repair to fore-margin touches ends of ll. 2784-85. rr6 Top margin, in MS pencil: 'See next Leaf but one 205'.

rr6-3b4 Starting at the end of Lear, the remaining leaves are damaged. Beginning with minor repairs to the foreorners, repaired damage increasingly extends on successive leaves up the fore-margins, taking letters, then words, from the outer columns. Additionally, 3a3 has a new top margin; 3a4 has a small burn hole; 3a6 has new margins all round and is soiled, but its text is legible. 3b1 and 3b3-4 are inlaid; as well as being soiled and stained, these leaves are badly damaged, with loss of text from the inner columns as well as the outer; 3b4 has the Reform Club stamp in the outer column. x1-6, 3a2, 3a5, 3b2 and 3b5-6 Missing. Following two blank leaves, counted as the replacements for 3b5-6: [viii-x].
PRESS-VARIANTS AND STATES

Two Gentlemen

C4v, l. 1383 'follow' (state 2).

l. 1395 'villaine' (state 2)

l. 1459 'grievously' (state 2).

Othello

vv2v, l. 2823 'hearts' (state 2).

vv3f, l. 3011 'Soule sat singing'

(state 2).

PROVENANCE Data: [i] Reform Club bookplate, pasted: 'Presented by Walter Wren, Esq.' [ii] Bookplate of Walter Wren, pasted. Top left corner (pencil): '33-92'. [iii] Leaf of Wren's notepaper, pasted along margin so that two sides are visible, signed by 'Walter Wren, M.A. Camb.', nd, in Wren's MS (ink): it gives Wren's theory concerning the provenance (see Owners, last paragraph, below). [iv] Sheet of older paper (with watermark) mounted: in MS (ink), recto and verso, it lists the volume's contents. On the verso, indicating the sheet had been used before: 'James Parker Esq. Hatchetts Hotel Piccadilly.' [v and vi] Two grey folio leaves of modern paper--bound in--have MS (ink) on the recto of each, giving standard bibliographical information of the First Folio. [v] Centre top, partly off the edge, a stamp: coat of arms of British Museum. There is no explanation for the presence of this stamp. πA1+1 Top left corner, two numbers erased, the second legible: '8431'. Reform Club stamp just above and touching the border of the portrait.

Addenda: (1) MS note, 7 Powis Square, [London] W, 18 September 1894, addressed to the Chairman of the Committee, Reform Club, signed by Walter Wren 'per sec.'--see Owners (5). (2) Two sheets of Reform Club foolscap, typed on three sides, dated 12 February 1952, listing in two columns the makeup of this copy against the Staunton 1866 facsimile (no indication of author).

Owners: (1) Possibly acquired in the seventeenth century by Admiral Robert Blake or a kinsman (see next paragraph). (2) <It was owned c 1810 by Robert Blake, M.P., and afterwards by [3] John Day Blake, who left it c 1860 to [4] his great-nephew, Walter Wren>. Presented to (5) the Reform Club <Aug. 26, 1883> by Walter Wren. Wren wished it to be known that: 'I presented my folio Shakespeare to our Club Library, as a sort of thank offering for the greatly increased enjoyment of my life by my being elected a member thereof' (Addendum 1). The Reform Club Library Committee voted 'Special Thanks' on 15 November 1883 (Club Minutes, Volume iii).

According to Wren, John Day Blake was a descendant of Cromwell's Admiral Robert Blake (1599-1657) or a kinsman. Wren's theory was 'that this folio . . . had been handed down from father to son in the Blake family for over 200 hundred years--
had never been owned by any body but a Blake—and that a Blake may possibly have been the original buyer' (Note pasted to [iii]).

**BINDING** (In red box, lettered 'SHAKESPEARE MDCCXXIII' (gilt).) (322 x 207 mm)

When Wren received it, 'It was bound in old leather, with “Plays” on a red label on the back' (Note on [iii]). Rebound late nineteenth century (no indication of binder): Wren 'saw that it had been handsomely bound' (Addendum 1). Red morocco; gilt lined border. The spine has six panels; second panel down: 'SHAKESPEARE' (gilt); third down: 'MDCCXXIII' (gilt). In good condition, though corners scuffed and front cover beginning to break away at the spine. All edges gilded. End-papers: machine marbled.

---

**GENERAL AND SPECIAL COMMENTS** The John Kemble and James Boswell (the younger) copy. Having been owned by (probably) two actors and two Shakespeare editors, the volume has a distinguished theatrical and editorial provenance. It is unusual in being complete and in being inlaid throughout (wide new margins). The text leaves are completely clean, with no underlinings or marginalia, and the text is virtually unmarred. Sumptuous binding. Belonging to a set of the four seventeenth-century Folios differently bound. Original leaves present: all.

**COLLATION** Original leaves are 299 x 181 mm, inlaid on modern paper 378 x 254 mm (see Other, below). Preliminaries: [i] Green lining paper. [ii] is not conjugate with [i] but tipped in; a letter tipped to its recto (see Provenance: Data, below). [iii-iv] Binder's leaves (thick) and [v-xxviii] binder's leaves (thin), all blank. πA1, πA1+1 The title-page is mounted on thick paper (verso blank); its letterpress (mounted separately from the portrait) is complete, except for the 'M' of MARTIN. The '&' and the 'S' (of 'TRAGEDIES') are slightly marred. The original inner margin is trimmed to the edge of the portrait. The portrait itself (192 x 161 mm) is State III and in good condition; a thin sliver of the bottom left corner is missing, but inked in. πA2-πA4, πA5+1, πA5, πA5+2, πA6. πA5+1 and 2 could not be bound in this order unless they (or πA2:5) had been separated--as of course all the sheets have in this volume before being individually inlaid.

**Text:** The number of very minor blemishes, most of which are noted below, does not affect the conclusion that textually this copy is virtually perfect. Some of the blemishes are tiny burn holes. A2 Small hole and thinning of paper in the centre of the page touching 'S' of 'Seeme' (l. 317) and 't' of 'forgot' (l. 383). A5v Stain obscuring

---

10 All the leaves of Folger 81 and 82 are also inlaid into new margins. See Chapter 5, Appendix D 2.
letters in 'him' (l. 1189) and 'Moone' (l. 1190). C3 Mark obscuring 'h' in 'There's' (l. 1261). H6 Tiny hole affecting 'Cur.' (l. 1334) and 'looks' (l. 1399). I2 Small hole (repaired) taking nearly three letters from 'Epidamium' (l. 1845). L6 Mark obscuring 'b' in 'infallibly' (l. 1328). M2 Mark partly obscuring letters in 'and strange' (l. 1744). M6 A small tear (c. 25 mm) crosses but does not obscure the text of l. 2846 on the verso. P5 Small hole repaired, taking the comma at the end of l. 1873 and obscuring two letters in l. 1931. Q4 Mark obscuring 'l' in 'Orl.' (l. 424). R1 Small tear (c. 20 mm) at the base of column a, not affecting the text. S1, column b, outside edge of letter-press pale (as if rubbed), affecting the box rule and the last words of the lines which reach to the rule. Tiny hole touching l. 2531 and taking two letters from l. 2720. S5 Tiny hole affecting letters in 'stand' (l. 678) and 'for' (l. 873). Mark partly obscuring last two letters in 'her' (l. 719). T6 Hole removing most of 'kisse' (l. 2529) and 'e' and 'as' of 'me as' (l. 2590).

Between Cc2 and a1 (ie, between the Comedies and the Histories): six blank binder's leaves bound in. c3 Bottom fore-corner repaired. Final comma and catchword lacking on recto. 'R' of 'Ros.', 'We' and beginning of 'three' lacking at foot of verso. d5 Tiny hole touching but not obscuring 'protect' (l. 2842) and 'Allies' (l. 20). f2 Repaired tear at foot of outside column and tiny hole touching catchword.

h6 Bottom fore-corner repaired, removing 'us' (l. 1384) and the end of 'bastards:' (l. 1389), part of 'o' of the catchword, and the first letters of ll. 1447-55. n4 Tiny mark affecting 'G' in 'Goe' (l. 1993) and 'S' in 'Seale' (l. 2059). o6 Small hole repaired removing 'th' of 'with' and 'the' of 'thee' (l. 510). q5 Repair to bottom fore-corner, taking from the recto the catchword and from the verso the openings of ll. 152 and 154-55. r6 and s1 Eight strips of light brown stain (about 11 mm wide) stretching across lower two-thirds of this opening, not obscuring the text.

Between x4 and X1 (ie, between the Histories and the Tragedies) six blank binder's leaves bound in. aa6 Some letters obscured by black marks in ll. 1480-88. ee6 Black mark obscuring second 'e' in 'Neither' (l. 857). mm3 Mark affecting letters in ''Faith' (l. 755) and 'Duncans' (l. 940). mm4 Mark affecting words in l. 1109. mm6 Small black mark obscuring 'r' in 'another' (l. 1614). nn5 Small mark affecting 'to' (l. 168) and 'Instrumentall' (l. 228). oo2 Marks affecting 'behaviour' (l. 894) and 'in my' (l. 973), and a tiny hole affecting 'Commission' (l. 1099). oo6 A fold in the paper caused 'g' of 'nothing' and all of 'must' (l. 2035) to be split in printing by a white blank. rr1 Tiny hole touching 'this' (l. 1326) and 'forth' (l. 1391). [xxix-lv] Binder's leaves (thin) and [li-viii] binder's leaves (thick)--all blank. [lix-lx] match [ii] and [i] respectively.
PRESS-VARIANTS AND STATES

Two Gentlemen

C4v, l. 1383 ‘follow’ (state 2).

l. 1395 ‘villaine’ (state 2).

l. 1459 ‘grievously’ (state 2).

Othello

vv2v, l. 2823 ‘hearts’ (state 2).

vv3r, l. 3011 ‘Soule sat singing’ (state 2).

PROVENANCE Data: [iv] The printed bookplate of ‘J. Soane’ pasted. On the bookplate in MS: ‘1623/41/Case 34 (3)’. Tipped to [iii] a letter (original, MS), Dublin, 25 February 1816, addressed to James Boswell, Temple, London, from (signed) J P Kemble, declining an unidentified request: ‘I am not at all well; my treacherous enemy the gout lies for ever in wait round me, and forbids me the shortest excursion into anything like the pleasure you propose.’

Addenda: (1) Card, with title: ‘The Four Folio Editions of Shakespeare’s Plays, 1623-1685.’, with brief standard information on each. (2) Six sides. MS. On one side: ‘To John Soane Esq’, [From] J Britton’, and the remains of a seal. On another side: a letter, 4 June 1825, to John Soane from John Britton describing his purchase of the First Folio in extravagant language of field sport and food.11 (3) Four sides, printed, paginated 5-8, titled ‘Collation of the First Folio’: mainly from Lowndes’s Bibliographer’s Manual, 1834, (standard information). (4) Four sides of foolscap. Sides 1 and 2 in the hand of George Bailey, who was Sir John Soane’s Chief Clerk and first Curator of the Museum. Side 1 includes a copy of Addendum 2 with an introduction signed ‘GB’: Bailey says Soane commissioned Britton to purchase the Folio, ‘without naming any sum’; Britton left late for the sale and ‘by galloping through the Streets, he reached the Sale Room at the very instant the Lot alluded to was on the Table’. Side 2 is a half page eulogy of the First Folio and Shakespeare, with a marginal reference to John Britton’s ‘“Autobiography” Vol II’. Sides 3-4 blank. (5) Three sheets folded to six foolscap sides and sewn, with the title: ‘Folio Editions of Shakespeare.’ In George Bailey’s hand. Consists of quotations from Dibdin’s Library Companion, 1824. (6) The archives of the Museum have the original bill from Britton showing ‘Shakespeare £105’.

Owners: (1) <Possibly the property of John Henderson the actor (1747-85), who disposed of an inlaid copy to [2] Isaac Reed the commentator, at whose sale (1807) it fetched £38. . . . [3] Acquired c 1807 by John Philip Kemble the actor, and was sold at Kemble’s sale in 1822 for £112 7s. to [4] James Boswell the younger.>

Rationalising the price he had paid, Boswell wrote: ‘I could not bring myself to a cold

11 The letter is quoted in part in a footnote at the beginning of Section E in Chapter 1.
calculation of the Value of a Copy which was at once a memorial of Shakespeare and of Kemble’ (Addendum 5). <Purchased at Boswell’s sale [at Sotheby’s] in June, 1825, by John Britton [as described in Addendum 2], on behalf of [5] Sir John Soane, for £105 [as recorded in Addendum 6].>

BINDING 393 x 256 mm. ‘Sumptuous’ (both Dibdin\textsuperscript{12} and Lee use this word) binding in olive-green drab morocco—blind and gilt tooled, front, back and spine. Bound by Mackinlay for Boswell c. 1822 at a cost of 60 guineas (£63).\textsuperscript{13} Perfect condition. Fore-edge lightly marbled; edges at top and foot gilt. The spine has seven panels; second panel down: ‘Shakespeare’s / Plays’ (gilt); sixth down: ‘London. / 1623.’ (gilt). The volume no longer has the ‘case of calf leather’ referred to by Dibdin.\textsuperscript{14}

OTHER The volume is noteworthy for having every leaf trimmed and inlaid. (The title-page is mounted). The inlaying is done to a very high standard. There is a thin red rule around the edge of each original leaf. The size of the original leaves (trimmed for inlaying) and the margins of new paper are approximately uniform throughout. Writing about this volume, Dibdin says the paper ‘was washed white and clean’ (1824, 412); overall the colour is now light brown; there are light white areas on some leaves. All the leaves appear flat, compared to untreated First Folio paper, as a consequence of the washing, pressing and perhaps steaming. The watermark in the paper on which the original leaves are inlaid is: ‘1799’ or ‘B / 1799’. The binder’s leaves (between the Comedies and Histories and between the Histories and Tragedies, as well as in the front and back) bear the same watermarks.

\textsuperscript{12} T F Dibdin, \textit{The Library Companion, or the Young Man’s Guide, and the Old Man’s Comfort in the Choice of a Library} (1824), 412.
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.
the UK, TLS noted that ‘a few [leaves were] supplied from another copy’. Original leaves present: eight preliminaries and all text.

**COLLATION: Preliminaries:** [i]-[iii] Modern paper. πA1 in facsimile. πA1+1 Letterpress in facsimile; the portrait, which is inlaid, is original and in good condition (state III). πA1+1\(^V\) A round stamp at centre foot of page: ‘Bibl. Londin. Univ.’ πA2 Repaired tears and bottom fore-corner. πA3, πA5+1-2, πA4-6.

**Text:** 316 x c. 202 mm. A2\(^V\) Small ink blots obscuring letters on ll. 371-73 and ll. 376-77. A5 Repair to bottom fore-corner, replacing the ends of ll. 1124-27, part of the ‘t’ of the catchword and the beginnings of ll. 1190-94 and 1196. B1\(^F\) ‘Exit’ partly obscured (l. 1639). L5\(^F\) Small blot touching letters in ll. 946-47. Q4 Repair to bottom fore-corner, replacing the ends of several lines on the recto and the beginnings of several lines on the verso. Ce2\(^V\) On the blank page, copying the title opposite, in a cursive script (ink): ‘The Life and Death of King John’. xgg4\(^F\) Small ink blots obscuring letters in ll. 2409-11. i2 Small burn hole taking letters from ‘Warre-’ (l. 1815) and ‘Swords’ (l. 2008). o5 Small repair obscures letters in ll. 248 and ll. 435 and 437. p1 Repaired double tear through twenty lines of text, but not obscuring it. q5 Fore-corner repaired, taking the catchword and ‘Till’ in l. 155.

‘gg3\(^V\)’ Loss of letters in ll. 83-85. ‘Troy’ corrected to ‘Pan’ (l. 114). j1\(^F\)-3j1\(^F\) Paginated in ink. aa6\(^V\) Some letters obscured, especially in ll. 1400-02. ‘Exeunt’ in MS ink after l. 1435. bb5 Inner column, tear through bottom seven lines of the text, but not obscuring it. Gg1\(^F\)-Gg2\(^V\) Pagination corrected. oo4\(^V\) Tiny blot obscures letters in ll. 1524. pp4 Outer column, repaired tear through bottom nine lines, not obscuring the text. rr1\(^V\) Thin white blanks (as if strips of paper came between the type and the page at the time of printing) mask all or part of quite a few letters, especially in ll. 1477-91. ss6 Repaired fore-edge taking part of the rule and just touching the text. zz1\(^F\) Exceptional amount of staining, slightly obscuring the text. zz1\(^V\) Tiny blot obscuring two letters. 3b3-6 The last leaves show wear and tear, with some corners repaired and creases pressed out. The text is not obscured, even on 3b5\(^V\) which is the most affected. 3b6 has a new inner margin, which touches several lines, and new fore-corners; some rules have been repaired in ink. 3b6\(^F\) A round stamp, below the colophon, touching ‘Aspley’: ‘Bibl. Londin. Univ.’ [iv], [v\(^F\)] Pencil (top right corner): ‘I 752’; (bottom right corner): ‘u’. [vi].

---

15 Reference 2, 112.
PRESS-VARIANTS AND STATES

Two Gentlemen

C4r, l. 1383 ‘follow’ (state 2).

Othello

vv2v, l. 2823 ‘heart’ (state 1).

l. 1395 ‘villaine’ (state 2).

vv3r, l. 3011 ‘Soule sat singing’

l. 1459 ‘grievously’ (state 2).

PROVENANCE Data:


Addendum: A typed card giving standard information on the First Folio.

Owners: (1) <Acquired by Francis Calley Gray, of Boston, U.S.A., c 1836; [2] inherited by F. C. Gray’s nephew, William Gray, of Boston, 1856; purchased by [3] Miss Mary Edgcumbe [sic] Blatchford, Cambridge, Massachusetts> 1879.> Miss Blatchford was the owner in Lee’s Census. She was one of the two Americans who in 1901-02 helped Sidney Lee the most in gathering information about American First Folios for his census. He acknowledges her enthusiastic work in the Census Introduction (17), and there is ample evidence of it in her correspondence with Lee filed in the Sir Sidney Lee Collection at the Birthplace Trust Records Office. (4) Sold at Sotheby’s 5 March 1935, on the instructions of the Massachusetts General Hospital (Reference 2, 112; BAR 32, 223). Purchased with the other three Folios by Robinson for £3,100, a price TLS called ‘somewhat disappointing’ (Reference 2, 148). (5) Purchased by Sir Louis Sterling (d 1958), an American who lived most of his life in England, for £3,500. (6) Bequeathed by Sir Louis to the University; received by the Library in 1956.

References: (1) Winsor, copy 2. (2) (No author), ‘Shakespeare Folios from America’, TLS, 21 February 1935, 112; (No author), Four Shakespeare Folios’, TLS, 7 March 1935, 148. (3) The Sterling Library: A Catalogue of the Printed Books and...

BINDING (Blue slip case.) 331 x 207 mm. Fine binding in dark blue morocco by Hayday (Stamp at foot of [iiV]). Good condition, only slightly scuffed. The spine has six panels with gilt decoration; second panel down: ‘Shakespeare’ on red leather label. Gilt geometrical decoration front and back. All edges gilded, with marbling beneath the gilding, most apparent on the fore-edge. End-papers marbled.

OTHER The acquisition of this volume c. 1836 by Francis Calley Gray is the earliest American purchase of a First Folio that I have found; it was not the earliest in the USA since Edmund Kean’s copy was presented to him in New York in 1820 (these points are covered above in Chapter 1, Section E). In 1935, TLS referred to the return of the volume with its three companion Folios to be sold in England, noting ‘the feeling on both sides of the Atlantic that a wider market is at present available [on this side of the Atlantic]’ and adding ‘the sentimentalist will hope that these four folios will stay’ (Reference 1, 112). This First Folio and West 43 (privately owned in the UK) are among the few which have been repatriated.

GENERAL AND SPECIAL COMMENTS Complete save πA1. Belonging to a set of the four seventeenth-century folios from the Durning-Lawrence Library, all boxed in red. Very clean, with no marginalia or underlining. A number of leaves—sometimes just the edges—neatly repaired without obscuring the text (though with some catch-words lost). A number of other leaves repaired with some (though limited) obscuring of the text. Some top rules partly cropped. Original leaves present: eight preliminaries and all text.

COLLATION Preliminaries: [i]-[iii]. πA1 Facsimile. πA1+1 Portrait state III; expertly repaired, including hole to right of Shakespeare’s left eye; set in new margins all round; letter-press completed in facsimile, including ‘Mr. W[illiam]’ and all of first and last two letters of ‘Shakespeare’ and parts of other letters; small amounts of the cross-hatched background to the portrait head also touched up at the corners; good overall appearance. πA2-6—all with repairs.

Text: 307 x c. 205 mm. Corrected pagination occasionally added lightly in pencil. There is repair, usually of a tear, to the following leaves; the repair touches the lines mentioned, without obscuring the text: E6 ll. 2622-25; R3-4 new bottom margins; on
R-4 the repair touches bottom line of text, recto and verso; f2v bottom line of column a (touching 'joyntes are'); f5 bottom line of outside column, recto and verso; n6 ll. 2533 and 2595-96; bb6 ll. 2932, 2934, 2936 and 2998-3002; dd1 ll. 857, 859-60 and 922-26; gg2 ll. 3102-07; ll6 ll. 86-89; nn4 ll. 89-95; bb4 ll. 3358 and 3422-29.

B2 Loss of some words in ll. 1820-22 and 2013. H5 Some words obscured in ll. 1133-34. Q3 'therefore' partly obscured (l. 71); slight obscuring in ll. 36-38. V2 Second half of l. 155 obscured; ll. 344-45 affected but readable. Y4 'with' (l. 483) affected. Y6 Repaired tear through ll. 1033-42 and 1225-33 slightly affects text. Z3 New top and bottom fore-corners, affecting ends of ll. 1805-06, 1809 and 1811, and beginning of ll. 1870-76 and 1926-30. b6 'Mowbray' (l. 10) and 'founded' (l. 12) partly obscured. c6 White spot obscures words on ll. 1702-04. f6 Stain obscures 'my' and 'saf' in 'safety' (l. 3147). o1 Bottom fore-corner repaired, affecting ll. 2775 and 2840-44. q5 Repaired tears affect ll. 64-91 and 126-53, with some obscuring of text. q6 Some words obscured on ll. 340-42 and 406-07. r6v and sF Small ink blot touches or obscures letters in ll. 1897-98 and 2071-72. v6 'Hats' obscured (l. 2493). j1r^-j2f are paginated 81-83 in pencil. bb3 'goe' (l. 2170) partly obscured. ec2 Ends of 'respect' and 'not' obscured (l. 3602). oo1 Repaired bottom fore-corner with loss of words in the bottom line of recto and verso. pp4 Words obscured on ll. 2989, 2992-94, 3053-54, 3057, and 3121-23, probably caused by cleaning. yyl Stain, especially affecting ll. 1716-17. 'Cries' obscured (l. 1742). zz4 Long repaired tear stretches over most of the leaf, but the text is legible. [iv]-[vi].

PRESS-VARIANTS AND STATES

Two Gentlemen

Othello

C4r, l. 1383 'follow' (state 2).
   l. 1395 'villaine' (state 2).
   l. 1459 'grievously' (state 2).

vv2v, l. 2823 'heart' (state 1).

vv3r, l. 3011 'Sonle set sining' (state 1).


Addendum: A typed note on the volume prepared for an exhibition.

BINDING (Boxed in board covered with red woven cloth.) 320 x 207 mm. Bound in red morocco. Good condition, though scuffed at the corners and edges. No indication of binder (though the Third and Fourth Folios in the set are bound by Rivière in closely similar though not matching bindings). Gilt decoration, front and back. The spine has six panels, highly decorated (gilt); second panel down: 'Shakespeare's Works 1623'. All edges gilded. End-papers marbled.

GENERAL AND SPECIAL COMMENTS Having been continuously in a library, this volume is in virtually the same state as at the end of the seventeenth century. It is blessed with all the text leaves and no loss of text other than a few letters; it has suffered little damage, is uncleaned, has not been repaired (save minor repairs to the title-page and the last leaf); and it has a seventeenth-century calf binding. There are occasional blots, marks and stains, hardly affecting the text; there are small markings in very light ink on many pages throughout the volume (tiny circles and lines, presumably by the same hand, never touching the text); and there are occasional marginalia, sometimes in a darker ink. Original leaves present: eight preliminaries and all the text.

COLLATION Preliminaries: [i]-[ii] Blank. [ii] Loose. ΠA1 in facsimile and is tipped to ΠA1+1. 21 ΠA1+1 Shows wear and is backed by a printed sheet (see Provenance: Data, below), pasted on, covering the verso almost entirely, though not

---

19 Case File 1996, Folger Shakespeare Library.
20 'The Duming-Lawrence Library was bequeathed to the University of London in 1929 by Lady Duming-Lawrence. The terms of the bequest are recorded in the Minutes of the Senate of the University of London 20 November 1929, min. 1697' (Letter, 17 April 1998, from Dr Walworth, cited above).
21 The author of Reference 2, below, wondered whether this leaf was 'removed by "Two gentlemen to examine Shakespeare folio"', entered in the Visitor's Book on February 27th 1864' (72).
quite reaching the binding (ie, the backing is not sewn in). The portrait is state III; there is a light marking on Shakespeare’s forehead and two small stains beneath his chin; in the bottom right corner some ink has been rubbed off Shakespeare’s garment. There is a small tear just above the right corner of the portrait which goes through ‘Copies’, but is effectively repaired by the leaf being pasted to the backing, and there is a small tear in the bottom edge. The bottom right corner of the leaf is repaired with a well-thumbed patch pasted between the original and the backing. $\pi A 1 + 1$ is tipped to an inserted leaf which in turn is tipped to $\pi A 2$ and is not (?) sewn in. The paper of the inserted leaf, which is blank, seems to be seventeenth century. 22 $\pi A 2 - 5$, $\pi A 6$, $\pi A 5 + 1 - 2$ All clean and in good condition.

Text: 332 x c. 220. Comments on the text are grouped under appropriate headings.

Leaves on which the text is affected (the damage is mostly minimal): 12 Fore-margin missing, bottom half of leaf, affecting two words. 15v Mark affecting words in ll. 584-85 and l. 587. 15v Small blot, outer column, touching words in ll. 649-50. L4-5 A hole in the inner margin taking text in ll. 21-26, 751-56 and 878-81. S3v Small hole in the bottom outside corner touching words in ll. 285-86. e3f ‘Francis’ crossed out in l. 973. e4 Small tear and hole in inner column; the hole touches a letter in each of the bottom lines of recto and verso. n1 A very thin leaf with a hole in the inner margin just touching the text on recto. n3-4 Tiny hole in inner column affecting words in ll. 1643 and 1903-04. n3v In the outer column, ‘Eleanor’ is crossed out three times and replaced by ‘Margaret’ in manuscript ink. s4f Blot obscures last word in l. 2813. j6v Blot obscures letters in ll. 1911-12. j51f Blot obscures last word in l. 1778. cc5f Tiny burn hole removing part of ‘displeas’d’ in l. 302. pp5 Tear in inner column through bottom fourteen lines on recto and bottom eleven lines on verso; small hole taking letters in lls. 3269, 3271 and 3466-67. rr5f Bottom fore-corner missing, taking part of the catchword and the end of ‘flowres’ (and, verso, the corner of the rule). zz4 Blot obscuring letters in lls. 329-30 and 396.

Mark(s), blot(s) (not obscuring text, or through which one can read the text): A2v, B1v, G6v, H6v, N1, T4, X4v, Y4; starting at a6 a large brown stain in upper part of outer column, diminishing in size and intensity on successive leaves and from d3 on confined to the fore-margin; t4v.

Manuscript, markings excluding the small light-ink markings mentioned above (not affecting text): on some leaves of Much Ado About Nothing. L1v, Cc1. t1v-t2r Marginal doodling. bb3f, Gg6v, hh1r, hh6 On the blank verso: ‘Timon of Athens’ (twice), ‘Memorancy’ and ‘Madan’—early hand in ink. kk3f The play title copied in top margin. ss6r.

22 It is not the same as First Folio paper: it is thicker and rougher; its chain lines are horizontal and are slightly wider apart than the First Folio’s; and its watermark does not appear to match any of those in the First Folio.
Marginal manuscript, slightly cropped from trimming: 13V, Q2V. m2
Exceptionally dark and obtrusive ink which shows through. 114V 'Samson'. qq1V
Two lines of manuscript written up the page in the outer margin; most of the first line is trimmed off; the second line reads approximately: 'But I desier the readeres mougth to kis the wrighteres arse'.

Tear in, or piece missing from, edge (touching text): 12, Q4, e1, §§4, ee2, nn4, ss5; (not touching text): A6, B5, D3, Q5, S4-5, T4, Z2, Z6, Aa5, a4, h6, 15, m3-4, s6, t6, v4, x2. 3§1 Bottom fore-corner is missing, taking part of the satyr ornament; this leaf is greatly trimmed (to 317 x 208 mm). aa4, mm3, pp2, ss4, vv5.

There are two leaves which have paper folded in at the edge that escaped trimming: N1, suggesting that c. 5 mm was trimmed off the bottom-edge of other leaves; and Gg3, suggesting that c. 1 mm was trimmed off the top-edge and c. 5 mm off the fore-edge of other leaves.23 P1 has a fold that was present when the leaf was printed, slightly affecting the text.

3b6 is a little damaged when compared to other leaves, mostly from creases, but the text is not obscured. There are two patches each on the top-edge and the fore-edge. 3b6V Written with the volume upside down, in different handwriting are: (1) 'The fear of the lord is the beginning', (2) A poem in French of fourteen lines including repetitions, (3) In several places, in lighter ink, initials which could be: 'JP', and (4) 'John Plomer / 1605'. [iii]-[iv].

PRESS-VARIANTS AND STATES

Two Gentlemen

Othello

C4t, l. 1383 'follow' (state 2).
l. 1395 'villaine' (state 2).
l. 1459 'grievously' (state 2).

vv2V, l. 2823 'hearts' (state 2).
vv3V, l. 3011 'Soule sat singing'

PROVENANCE Data: πA1V At foot: 'This Facsimile of missing leaf was presented by Mr. Lionel Booth March 30th 1889.'24 πA1+1 Stamped in the centre of the bottom margin is an octagonal lozenge containing: 'Dr. D. Williams's Library / Red Cross Street / London.' (The Library was formerly in Red Cross Street.)

23 The original horizontal dimension of this leaf--c. 220 + c. 5 mm--poses a puzzle. The total of c. 225 mm exceeds the possible maximum of 222.25 (see Chapter 2, Section C on Measurements). The explanation could be that such a tiny amount is within the margin of measuring error and/or this bifolium was originally wider than the average (the determination of the average is covered in Chapter 2) and/or it was not folded at its centre when bound.

24 Lionel Booth published a facsimile edition of the First Folio in 1862-64--described below in Appendix I, 'Facsimile Editions of the First Folio'.

The printed backing on the title-page is not dated; it is headed: ‘Books Printed by Peter Cole at the Exchange in London . . .’ and contains four columns of text describing under two headings ‘Physick Books’ and ‘Divinity Books’. Peter Cole, who flourished 1637-65, was a bookseller before adding printing to his business in 1643; he printed and sold chiefly theological books. Under the first heading are ‘Several Physick Books of Nich. Culpeper, Physitian and Astrologer, and Abdiah Cole Doctor of Physick, commonly called, The Physitians Library . . .’ Nicholas Culpeper (1616-54), who is well represented in Wing, was an astrologer and physician in London. Among other things he translated many medical works into English, some of which it is said he left to Peter Cole, Abdiah Cole (16107-70?), whose name does not appear on Culpeper’s title-pages (with one exception) till after Culpeper died and who may have been a relative of Peter Cole, prepared a large number of Culpeper’s works for the press. Under the second heading, ‘Divinity Books Printed by Peter Cole . . .’, are listed works by eight authors who flourished between 1586 and 1680, including Thomas Hooker: they were all Non-Conformist divines and most had been to Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

Addenda: (1) 3 x 5 card, describing the copy. (2) One-page (printed) prepared at a time when the volume was about to be exhibited, apparently written by S K Jones (see Reference (3), below).

Owners: The volume was among the original collection of books bequeathed by Dr Daniel Williams (c. 1643-1716), a Presbyterian minister and benefactor, and appears in the Library’s first printed catalogue of 1727 (entry 571). The Library has no record of its purchase. As Stephen Jones says, Dr Williams ‘founded the library, but the nucleus was collected’ by Dr William Bates (1625-99), whose library Williams purchased in 1699 when Bates died. Bates, educated partly at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, was also a Non-Conformist divine; Pepys heard him preach in St Dunstan’s, calling him ‘silver-tongued’. There is no proof as to which of the two first purchased the volume. However, Reference 2 says:

Comparatively few of the books have a name in them, and it is dangerous to jump to conclusions from a few isolated instances. But judging from a certain number of autographs, and from what is known of the two doctors, it may be taken that generally speaking the choice editions of the classics and other books which appeal to the bibliophile are from the library of Dr. Bates, the solid theology from that of Dr. Williams himself. (64-65)

---

26 *DNB*, 5, 286-87.
27 *DNB*, 4, 719-20.
28 *DNB* 21, 385-89.
29 Reference 3, 1.
30 *DNB* 1, 1319-20 and Reference 3, 5.
Jones in Reference 3 accepted that Bates rather than Williams first bought the book:

Neither Bates nor Williams was a bibliophile in the narrower sense of the term. Neither was a collector of first editions, large paper copies, beautiful bindings, or incunabula. All the books were acquired to be read. Bates . . . was not a collector but a 'devourer' of books; and when he acquired [a First Folio], we may safely assume that it was not as a rare and valuable edition that he coveted it, but because, at the time, it was a reasonably cheap copy to 'devour'. (14)

Given the Non-Conformist link between Peter Cole and Dr Bates and the fact that Cole had been a bookseller before he was a printer, it is tempting to speculate: Bates could have had the title-page backing sheet directly from Cole, or have had Cole's shop repair or rebind the Folio, or even have purchased the Folio from or through Cole.

From the point of view of provenance, one could speculate further that the light ink markings throughout, the sign of an extensive reading of Shakespeare, are those of Dr Bates. It is more likely that he rather than Dr Williams first purchased the volume; the markings are similar enough to conclude they were made by the same hand; and he was a 'devourer' of books. It is unlikely that the markings were made before the title-page backing was pasted on, because the well-thumbed patch in the bottom corner was almost certainly added at the same time; and it is plausible that the trace of frequent thumbing on the patch was made by the same avid reader who penned the markings. Finally, one could reasonably assume the markings were not made by (the solidly theological) Dr Williams and that once his Library of mostly religious books was launched in the early eighteenth century, its Non-Conformist users would not be frequent Folio readers: Reference 3 says the library was little used in the eighteenth century (2); the implication of the 1872 letter (Reference 1) is that the volume was unknown outside the library in the nineteenth century; thus the markings, in what appears to be an early ink, probably pre-date Dr Williams's ownership. In short, the balance of probability suggests that Dr Bates first purchased the volume and then 'devoured' it.

References: (1) A short letter, extolling Dr Williams's Library, refers to 'the finest first folio Shakespeare I have ever seen' in N&Q (1872), 447. (2) [No author], A Short Account of the Charity & Library Established Under the Will of the Late Rev Daniel Williams, DD (1917) is the bicentenary account of the Library. (3) Stephen Kay Jones (former Chief Librarian), Dr Williams and his Library (Cambridge, 1948). (4)

---

31 The term is quoted from the oration preached at Bates's funeral (Reference 3, 4). The sermon also gives an indication of Bates's literary taste: he was 'curious in his choice. Whatsoever belong'd to the finer, and more polite sort of literature, was most grateful to him'.

32 Or Dr Williams, though he was only about 20 when the backing was printed.

33 The Preface says R Travers Herford, Librarian, and Stephen K Jones, Sub-librarian, were responsible for 'the substance of the work' (v).
[John O Creasey] (Librarian), 'Dr. Williams’s Library (founded 1729)' [1979] is a six-page pamphlet about Dr Williams and the Library.

**BINDING** 338 x 223 mm. ‘Seventeenth-century calf boards, rebacked probably about the middle of nineteenth century.’ Good condition, though corners worn and edges slightly scuffed. Blind stamped. Centre of front cover ‘D. W. L.’ (gilt). The spine has seven panels; second panel down: ‘Shakespeare.’ (gilt on brown leather label); bottom panel: ‘with / Mss / Extra / 13/^(ink on white paper label) and ‘Lond. / 1623.’ (gilt on brown leather label). Edges not gilded. End-papers in vellum.

If the title-page backing was added when the volume was given its present binding, as seems quite likely, the latest date of publication among the titles listed there would establish a *terminus ad quem* for the date of the binding. Reference to Wing shows that the titles were mostly published between 1644 and 1665. The one published in 1665 is Nicholas Culpeper, *The English Physitian* (Wing C7505). However, Peter Cole published this work a number of times before 1665 (from 1653 on); the book listed on the sheet could therefore be the 1665 edition or any of the earlier editions. Thus 1665 is only a possible *terminus ad quem*. A firm *terminus* would be provided by the latest date of a *first* edition. Wing shows that, among the titles listed on the sheet, there are two first editions, both in 1661 (Borroughs’s book, Wing B6066, and Marshall’s book, Wing M747). Thus, one can conclude that the sheet was pasted to the title leaf during or any time after 1661 (or 1665).

**OTHER** There are several elements in the story of this volume which are of note from the viewpoint of book history. Its plain calf seventeenth-century binding is not rare, but it is a good example. Then it is distinguished for the length of time it has been in one library. If Bates first bought it, he probably did so any time from mid-century (when he was 25) to 1661-65 (by when the backing sheet was printed). Its presence in the Bates-cum-Williams library, or for that matter just in the Williams library, controverts Otness’s supposition that West 4—at Trinity College, Cambridge, since 1779—'may have the longest uninterrupted library ownership’ (97). It does not, however, outdo the copy in Durham, purchased by Bishop Cosin c. 1630 and bequeathed to the clergy of his diocese in 1672.  

It is also distinguished by the length of time it has been in what one could term a ‘public’ library. Possibly one could claim that the Cosin copy has been in a ‘public’ library (or what became a public library) since 1672. One can certainly claim the Dr Williams’s copy has been in a public library either since 1711 (the date of Dr Williams’s will, in which he left his collection ‘for a public library, whereto such as my Trustees shall appoint shall have access’), or 1716 (when he died), or 1727 (when the

---

34 Second addendum.
35 Lee, *Census*, copy 47.
36 Reference 2, 47.
Library's catalogue was issued) or 1729 (when the newly built library was opened to the public).^7

As a First Folio, this volume is unusual in not having been refurbished (other than an inconspicuous repair to the spine). It has escaped the amount of trimming typical of most copies and, as shown in a footnote above, its fore-margins are exceptionally wide. At the same time, its condition reflects its long and protected library existence; its pages that are not marked are pristine and the paper is quite crisp.

In maintaining this long presence in the Library, the book offers a gloss on book history. Dr Williams expressly stated in his will that 'duplicates . . . be given away' and Reference 2 says that in the eighteenth century this permitted 'the wholesale discarding of first and early editions on the acquisition of a later one'. The fact that this Folio, unlike the one in the Bodleian, was not sold 'we may put down to the fortunate chance that for one hundred and fifty years it remained the only edition of Shakespeare's works in the Library; did not, in fact, become a "duplicate" till 1865, when Lionel Booth presented a copy of his reprint' (75).

Finally, the volume was misused to support a contention concerning both the attitude towards the First Folio and the reputation of Shakespeare's plays in the seventeenth century. Sidney Lee cites this volume's presence in the Library as 'evidence that serious-minded scholars and clergymen exempted the Shakespeare First Folio from the ban which they pronounced on other books of stage plays'. He further found it gratifying 'to know the kind of reputation which Shakespeare's plays early acquired in dissenting circles'. He based both statements on his belief that this Folio was 'a solitary representative of dramatic literature amid stacks of Nonconformist theology'. While it is of interest to find a First Folio in the library of a seventeenth-century Non-Conformist divine, this volume was not 'a solitary representative': the library possessed a number of dramatic works, including those of Beaumont and Fletcher, Dryden and Molière. It seems likely that these works owe their presence in the Library to Dr Bates's breadth of taste and that the Folio owes its continuance in the Library to the very opposite of Lee's contention: namely that the Non-Conformist trustees, consistent with their traditional attitude towards plays, did not purchase a duplicate.

^7 Reference 2, 50.
^8 Reference 3, 10.
^9 Lee, 1924, 93-94.
^10 Addendum 2.
GENERAL AND SPECIAL COMMENTS

Known as the ‘Ashburnham’ copy. The text is complete and virtually unimpaired. There is some staining. The leaves are limp, presumably from washing. Original leaves: all.

COLLATION

Preliminaries: [i]-[iii] blank. A hole through each leaf πA1-A1 has been repaired, with the letterpress replaced in ink. πA1 Top and foot reinforced with glacine paper. πA1+1 The portrait (280 x 161 mm) (third state) is mounted on glacine paper margins--the first ‘S’ of ‘Shakespares’ slightly trimmed, and the last ‘S’ completed on the modern edge; immediately above the portrait (MS brown ink): ‘Gentle Maister Shakspear.’ The repaired hole, about 20 x 15 mm, is centred on Shakespeare’s jaw bone. There is a stain to the (reader’s) left of Shakespeare’s face, on the ruff and the background. The leaf appears to be bound in rather than tipped to πA2. πA2-4, πA5+1-2, πA5 and πA6 all have new inner margins. πA2 New fore-edge and bottom-margin; πA5+2 Repaired fore-corner; πA5 has an additional large hole repaired at the top; and πA6 has a new fore-edge and a large repair to the top-edge.

Text: 326 x c. 214 mm. Damage affecting the text: A1 Tiny repaired tears at the foot, one touching the catchword; tiny repaired hole touching letters on the recto in l. 60. A2 Repair to bottom fore-corner with loss of ‘bour’ of ‘labour’ (l. 350) and, on the verso, the catchword and the first words of the last five lines. The replacement of the lost text in ink shows through. C5 Mark touching letters in ‘friend’ (l. 1731). E5 Bottom fore-corner repaired, taking some of the rule, part of the comma in l. 2369 and a letter in l. 2429. I6v Blot obscures letters in l. 991. K1 Tiny burn hole, taking parts of letters on the recto in ll. 1160-61 and 1194-95. K3v Tiny blot, touching letters in l. 1751. M6r Repaired tear to bottom margin passes through the last line of column b. N6r Tiny blot obscures letter in l. 1319. R2v ‘his’ changed to ‘your’ in MS ink (l. 1377). R6v Tiny blot obscures letters in l. 2422. Y5 Small repaired hole affecting letters in ll. 779-80 and 969-70. Bb3r Tiny blot obscures letters in ‘goest’ (l. 2133). a1v Tiny burn, taking letters in ‘ere’ (l. 210). e6 A blot obscures letters in ll. 1674-76. m2 Tiny hole, repaired, affecting text in ll. 2921-22. m3 Repaired tear in bottom fore-corner going through bottom six lines of text. s3 A blot obscures letters in ‘Sister’ (l. 2485). t6 Repaired tear at bottom fore-corner goes through five lines of text; words at the beginning of ll. 904-07 are replaced in facsimile. bb2v Tiny burn takes two letters from ‘noble’ (l. 1957). dd2 Tiny burn takes two letters in l. 1032 and touches letters in ll. 1031 and 1216-17. dd6v Blot obscures first two words of l. 2134 (‘And as’)
which are written in the margin in ink. ff1V ‘Nur’ is replaced with ‘Rom’ in MS ink (l. 1267).

Repairs not affecting the text—repaired tears, new margins (sometimes a whole margin is replaced, often not neatly executed): C5, E4, E6, F4-6, I3-5, Z1, a1, b4, c2-4, d2-4, e2-4, e6, m3-4, o3, ‘gg3’, gg2, oo5, 3b4.

Other: C4 has a smaller fore-margin, with a tiny repair. Bb2-3 have marks (not obscuring the text). B5v A letter or two in most lines has not printed, caused presumably by a narrow strip of (?) paper coming between the type and the page. H6v Stain touching three lines but not obscuring text. N2 Repaired tear from the fore-margin across the text of the outer column and into the inner, not obscuring the text. b1f-4f Staining (not obscuring the text). d2f Exceptionally stained. k5 Repaired tear through the text of ll. 711-27 and 772-88, but not obscuring it. q3v Markings in bottom margin, noteworthy only because they are exceptional. 3a A small patch near the bottom fore-corner extends over some words, but does not obscure them. 3b5 has a repair at the beginnings of ll. 3518-21 and the ends of ll. 3716-19, and a repaired tear through the text, outer column—neither obscuring the text. 3b3-6 have suffered more than most leaves, but the text is not obscured. [iv]-[vi] Blank.

PRESS-VARIANTS AND STATES

Two Gentlemen

Othello

C4f, l. 1383 ‘follow’ (state 2).
C4f, l. 1395 ‘villaine’ (state 2).
C4f, l. 1459 ‘grievously’ (state 2).

vv2v, l. 2823 ‘hearts’ (state 2).
vv3v, l. 3011 ‘Soule sat singing’ (state 2).

PROVENANCE Owners: (1) <Acquired c 1830 by Bertram, fourth Earl of Ashburnham.> (2) Purchased by Sir Arthur Hodgson for £585, on behalf of the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, through Henry Sothean & Co in the auction of the Ashburnham Library at Sotheby’s, 11 May 1898.42


GENERAL AND SPECIAL COMMENTS Probably more eyes have seen this copy than any other. It is the one which the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust has on permanent display. The volume is deprived—in terms of missing leaves, some badly damaged leaves and the poor quality of its early repairs—but most of the leaves it retains are well preserved and present the text clearly. In 1994, the Centre considered refurbishing and possibly rebinding the volume, but happily retained the binding in which they had received it and undertook only minor repairs (see below). As most copies have been thoroughly refurbished, this volume offers an opportunity—increasingly rare since the eighteenth century—of sensing what it was like to use a normally well-worn and poorly cared-for copy.43 Original leaves present; no preliminaries; 390 text.

COLLATION Preliminaries: [i]-[ii]. [iii^y] The back of the engraving shows through a cut-out in the leaf; the engraving, pasted to [iii^v], is a copy of the portrait (only 131 x 106 mm); the engraver's name is given beneath: 'J. Swaine fc./SHAKESPEARE/ from the First Folio Edition.'44 All original preliminaries lacking.

Text: (Cl) 332 x c. 202 mm. Despite the damage to some leaves, the text on the majority of the leaves is unimpaired. There are occasional tears (some repaired), conspicuous strips and patches (referred to under 'Repairs' below), some blots, some tiny burn holes (eg, dd2-3), spotting, and water staining (eg, s2-x4 and hh1), but the text is mostly clear. There are almost no marginalia (one exception is (quill?) pen scribblings across the top margins of m3^v-n4^v) and only a few corrected words and page numbers. Following the last leaf (3b1), there is only one bifolium ([iv]-[v]), [v^v] being the paste-down. The following excludes most minor faults.

Missing leaves (and plays) The lacunae are usually noted in pencil in the top margin of the page following the missing leaf or leaves. There are sixty-five missing text leaves: A1-B6, C3, C5, D3-4, N1, V6, Y3-4, Cc1-2, b1-6, m2-4, cc3, hh2, hh6, nn2-5, qq2, qq4, rr1, rr6, ss1-vv6, 3b2-6. Thus, there are only two big gaps: the preliminaries, all of The Tempest and the first three leaves of Two Gentlemen; and seven leaves of King Lear, all of Othello and the first page of Antony & Cleopatra.

---

43 In a similar vein, D F Foxon speaks of the 'most illuminating experience' of getting close to the original, and this was when he had been reading the Yale facsimile edition for review—"Book Reviews", Book Collector, 4 (1955), 261-62 (262).
44 John Swaine (1775-1860) is 'best known by his excellent facsimile copies of old prints, of which the most noteworthy are the Droeshoute portrait of Shakespeare...'(DNB, 1891).
Leaves with missing text: D6 (bottom half missing), H5, K6, T5, f2, xgg1-2 (about one third of text in outer column missing), xgg3-7, i3, o1, v6, aa3, ee4, dd6-ee3 (bottom fore-corners badly damaged), ee5, ll6, qq1. The following, in the order in which bound, have badly damaged fore-edges: rr5, rr4, rr3, qq3, qq5. 3b1, the last original leaf in the volume, is torn off diagonally, losing about one third of the text in the outside column.

Shorter leaves: These leaves are trimmed and are presumably from other copies. Their vertical measurements vary (from c. 304 to c. 318 mm). C4, H5, S3-4, Y2, Y5, Z2-6, f2. The following leaves are given in the order in which bound: k3-5, l1, k6, l2, m5-6, o1-5, q6, s2-x4, dd6-ee2, ee5-6, ff2-Gg1. The following two sequences are given in the order in which bound: oo2, oo1, nn6, pp6, pp2-5, pp1, oo6, oo3-5, qq1; rr5, rr4, rr3, qq3, qq5-6, rr2, yy1-6.

Leaves bound in the wrong order: C4 (which is the fourth leaf in the volume, ie, the first leaf of text) before C1. K6 between l1 and l2. ff1 before ee6. The order of leaves in quires nn-qq is as follows, after nn1: oo2, oo1, nn6, pp6, pp2-5, pp1, oo6, oo3-5, qq1. Following Hamlet, there are two leaves of Antony & Cleopatra, seven leaves of King Lear, followed by the rest of Antony & Cleopatra, as follows: qq1, zz1-2, rr5, rr4, rr3, qq3, qq5-6, rr2, xx1.

Repairs: Many leaves were rather crudely repaired, presumably in the nineteenth century, by pasting conspicuous strips of stiff white paper along damaged, outer margins. There are also patches of the same material, particularly over damage to the inner margins at the top. The repairs undertaken in 1995 are recorded in Addendum 4, from which the following is abstracted (with signatures in place of page numbers):

Existing repairs were left and the tears repaired with Paper Nao Japanese Kozo tissue and rice starch paste to the following leaves: C1, C5, H5, l1, R6, S6, V2, Y1, Y6, e3-4, f2, h1-3, dd6-ee3, ee6, ff3-4, kk2-5, rr5, rr4, rr3, qq4-6, rr2, 3a6.

The paper repairs were removed from the following leaves with a paste poultice: xgg3-7.

The following were repaired with Griffen Mill Handmade Paper and rice starch paste: xgg8-h1.

PRESS-VARIANTS AND STATES

Two Gentlemen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C4f, l. 1383</td>
<td>'follow' (state 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. 1395</td>
<td>'villaine' (state 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. 1459</td>
<td>'grievously' (state 2).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Othello

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vv2-3</td>
<td>are missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROVENANCE Data: [i\textsuperscript{V}] Top left corner: ‘Case II, Shelf c’; top right corner: ‘C.5 No. 3’ crossed out; top: (MS in ink) ‘Presented to the Shakespeare Museum by Miss Wheler’. [ii\textsuperscript{T}] Top (pencil): ‘NO 26’. [iii\textsuperscript{V}] Top left: ‘824’.

Addenda: (1) Letter signed by ‘J. O. Halliwell’ (ie, Halliwell-Phillipps), 7 December 1852 to Robert Bell Wheler (in which Halliwell offered twelve guineas for a third Folio on ‘your too wide shelf of Shakespeare folios’). The letter is preserved in the Centre’s Record Office (ER1/20f). It mentions this volume and its poor condition:

Your folio wants to[o] much mending & sizing--so much more than I could judge--that I should not be surprized at the expense going to as high as £10 which is a sum I should not advise to be spent upon it. I should therefore wait patiently till another imperfect copy turned up.

(2) Clair Walton, Archives Conservator at the Centre, ‘Notes on the Fragment First Folio’, 23 November 1994 (seven pages).\textsuperscript{45} The notes are taken mostly from documents (on file at the Centre’s Record Office) which refer to this volume and from two works on bookbinding. (3) Clair Walton, ‘Report: The Fragment First Folio’, 23 November 1994 (six pages). This describes the binding and its condition, gives its history and discusses and recommends treatment. (4) [Clair Walton], ‘Fragment First Folio’, 3 May-20 June 1995 (reference CR 185, WN 182) (two pages). This is the report of the repairs Ms Walton undertook in 1995.

Owners (1) <Acquired c 1820 by Robert Bell Wheler, of Stratford-upon-Avon>. (2) ‘In 1862 Miss Anne Wheler presented to the Birthplace Museum a collection of books and documents formed by her late brother, Robert Bell Wheler. The collection was placed in the care of Mr. [W O] Hunt [Town Clerk] until the proposed library was erected. A manuscript list prepared at the time lists amongst books, deeds and papers in a large deal box: “Shakespeare’s Plays fragment of 1st edition of 1623” with pencil annotation “No. 27... A large fragment only”. . . . The Library accession book starts with several existing acquisitions all at 1898: “2... 1898... Imperfect presented by Miss Anne Wheler”’ (Addendum 3, p 3).

BINDING 342 x 208 mm. ‘Half bound calf (?) with marbled paper to black millboards. Marbled paper has large combing pattern in yellow, red, [buff] and blue’ (Addendum 4, p 1). The spine has six panels; second panel down: ‘Shakespeare’ (gilt); fourth down: ‘Fragment of First Folio’ (gilt)––’the gold lettering on the spine applied with type holder’ (Addendum 4, p 1). Edges and joints of binding slightly worn. The edges of the volume were not trimmed when it was last bound and are worn and rough. End-papers: plain white heavy nineteenth-century paper. Addendum 3

\textsuperscript{45} Addenda 2-4 are filed in the Archives Conservation Office.
concludes that the volume was ‘in its existing binding by [1868]’ (p 4) and ‘it would appear that the binding and repairs date somewhere in the first seventy years of the nineteenth century’ (p 5).

GENERAL AND SPECIAL COMMENTS

Owned by the Royal Shakespeare Theatre, but kept by the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust at the Shakespeare Centre Library. Known, at least in Stratford, as ‘the Theatre(‘s) copy’, as distinct from the two copies owned by the Trust. The preliminaries are in facsimile. Original leaves present: preliminaries none; text all, with the possible exception of the last.

There are two autographs, 1705, most likely of Samuel Madden, who was probably an earlier owner. The fore-margins of all leaves of Henry VIII are replaced (but not those of the leaves preceding or following the play). There is no obvious explanation for this, but the play could have come from a different copy: the fact that it is not made up of discrete quires would argue slightly against this; the fact that the corrected pagination on one of its leaves is unique in this volume would argue slightly for it. In Richard III, there is a series of neatly written directions (‘stop’ and ‘go on’) -- all, with one exception, at scene endings. Again, there is no obvious explanation, though one could speculate about a reading or a performance.

The text leaves are clean throughout. There are minor marks, stains and repairs (not all noted below), but these do not obscure the text. There are also occasional tiny burn marks, sometimes taking a letter or two, and marginal signs marking passages of text; the most frequent sign is a hand with a pointing fore-finger. Despite the details in the Collation section which follows, the leaves overall are in very good condition.

COLLATION

Preliminaries: [i]-[iii]. [A1]-[6], in facsimile; Lee, Census, says <in Harris facsimiles>. Lee also says the portrait is inlaid, which is not correct, and that it is <a modern reproduction of the early proof impression>, which is correct. The opening--[A1v]-[A1+1r]--is discoloured to a dark brown from having been ‘on display for many years in the library at the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre’ (Letter, Marian J Pringle, 21 January 1998). <To this copy originally belonged the early proof impression of the portrait which was detached by Halliwell-Phillipps, and was sold with the Halliwell-Phillipps Shakespearean Collection in 1897, to Marsden J. Perry, Esq., Providence, Rhode Island, U. S. A.>

---

46 In the card catalogue it has accession number 1. This is the number given by the original Memorial Library, not to be confused with the accession number 1 for Lee 17, given by the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust.
In Richard III there is a series of manuscript directions in ink, almost certainly in an eighteenth-century hand: ‘stop.’ (end of I iv); ‘go on.’ (start of II iii); ‘stop.’ (end of II iii); ‘go on.’ (start of III i); (no ‘stop.’ at end of III i); ‘go on’ (start of III iv); ‘stop.’ (V ii, after l. 3578).

Running down the page, ‘F O R T C’ (?). t2v, v2v (ie, all of Henry VIII) all fore-margins replaced. v2v Pagination corrected. bb4-5 Tiny burn hole obscuring letters in ll. 2405, 2466 and 2664. cc2 Tiny burn hole affecting a letter in l. 3572. ff2v See Provenance: Data (8), below. gg3-4 Bottom fore-corner repaired. nn4 Bottom fore-corner repaired. hh6v See Provenance: Data (9), below. nn6 Top- and fore-margins replaced. pp5v ‘sixteene’ crossed out and ‘sexton’ written in ink (l. 3351). tt5v ‘eep’ in the first ‘keepes’ has been crossed out and ‘now’ has been written in above (l. 2105).47 3a3 The stage direction is continued in manuscript ink: ‘coming out of a Cav[e]’, with much of the final ‘e’ cropped (l. 1554). ‘Slepe’ crossed out, with ‘Stoop’ written in the margin in ink (l. 1556). 3b1 has a rough fore-edge. 3b2-5 New inner margins, with additional margins to 3b5. 3b6 Facsimile (?), with new inner and bottom margins, a small repair to the fore-margin and a tiny burn mark touching three letters in l. 3812. 3b6v Stamp of ‘Shakespeare Memorial Library’. [iv], [v]* Top left corner, manuscript ink, ‘C. and P. J. O. H.’ [vi].

PRESS-VARIANTS AND STATES

Two Gentlemen

C4*, l. 1383 ‘follow’ (state 2).
C4*, l. 1395 ‘villaine’ (state 2).
C4*, l. 1459 ‘grievously’ (state 2).

Othello

vv2*, l. 2823 ‘hearts’ (state 2).
vv3*, l. 3011 ‘Soule sat singing’

47 John Payne Collier, Plays (1853) introduced the reading ‘knows’. I am grateful to Professor Stanley Wells for calling my attention to this. Q2 has ‘feels’, which is followed by some editors.
PROVENANCE Data: The three binder's leaves contain an abundance of information: (1) (Pencil) Gives Sam Timmins as the source of the story about the portrait. (2) (Ink), in the hand of and signed by Charles Edward Flower: 'Bought through Mr Bennet at the Sale of HP's books. Charles E Flower 1889'. (3) A printed note, pasted in, gives the story of the portrait in some detail. At the foot of the note (printed)--'G M R Turbutt', then (MS) 'Athenæum. 25. 3. 1905'. (4) (Pencil) Notes that this is a first edition and the preliminaries and last leaf are in facsimile, then adds '120 guineas'. (5) (Ink) Notes a few variants, then adds in pencil in a different hand: 'Note by J O Halliwell Phillipps'. (6) (Pencil) Notes a variant, followed by 'W. S. B.'.

(7) Is a typed note pasted in. It relates the story of the volume's trip to Rome: 'This copy . . . was taken to Rome in 1964 and used by three members of the Shakespeare Theatre Company who participated in a Shakespeare recital on 12 November . . . before His Holiness Pope Paul VI and an audience of 2000, including the College of Cardinals and many other dignitaries attending the Second Vatican Council'. The note has the following sentence crossed out: 'After the recital Dorothy Tutin presented this Folio to Pope Paul VI who blessed it'. According to Sylvia Morris, Deputy Librarian at the Shakespeare Centre Library (quoting Tony Church, one of the three RSC players to recite before the Pope) when the volume was presented to the Pope for blessing, the Pope accepted it thinking it was a gift, 'almost causing an international incident'. The Library's belief is that the volume returned to Stratford unblessed. (8) ff2 (bottom margin, in manuscript ink) A small signature: 'S Madden 1705'. (9) On the blank page hh6 there is a large signature in ink: 'S Madden August --[?] 25th. 1705'.

Addendum: A copy of the Programme, 12 November 1964, for the recital before the Pope is in the Shakespeare Centre Library--see Provenance: Data (7), above.

Owners: (1) The dates on ff2 and hh6 suggest that the volume may have been purchased in 1705. The accompanying signatures most likely belong to Samuel Timmins, 1826-1902, was a prominent citizen of Birmingham and a Shakespeare scholar. He was a force behind the formation of the Birmingham Shakespeare Library and a trustee of Shakespeare's Birthplace (Birmingham Daily Post, 13 November 1902). He wrote Books on Shakespeare (London, nd). 49


50 The owner of the original Bodleian copy prior to its return to the Bodleian in 1906. The short article in The Athenæum (p 380) concerns the portrait, pointing out that a copy in State 1 'remains on this side of the Atlantic, in the Malone copy'.


52 The superscript 'a' has a dot under it, rather than the more normal colon following it, to indicate an abbreviation. The interpretation of it as an abbreviation of 'Samuel' was confirmed by Ms Mairi Macdonald, Deputy Archivist. She also confirmed the manuscript directions in Richard III as eighteenth century.
Madden DD (1686-1765, b Dublin), described in *DNB* (1893) as a ‘miscellaneous writer and philanthropist’. He wrote two plays, the first of which had ‘considerable success’ in London; the second he bequeathed to Thomas Sheridan. He was apparently on friendly terms with Swift. Dr Johnson assisted him in preparing one of his works for publication and declared that “his was a name Ireland ought to honour”. He ‘succeeded to the family estates,’ when his father died in 1703. In short, as a wealthy man with literary associations and dramatic leanings, it is not unlikely he would purchase a First Folio, even at the age of nineteen.

(2) Apparently bought (or offered) for 120 guineas ([ii^v]) c. 1865 or before. [Acquired by James Orchard Halliwell-Phillipps c 1865.] The note on [v^t] indicates he collated the volume. [3] [Sold with other books from Halliwell-Phillipps’s library in July 1889 for £95, when it was acquired by Charles Edward Flower, of Stratford-upon-Avon, for [4] presentation to the [Shakespeare] Memorial Library there.]

**BINDING:** (Boxed 1974 in board covered with red woven cloth.) 325 x 208 mm. ‘Bound by F Bedford’ (stamp in gilt decorative border at foot of [i^v]). Dark red, full, grained leather. The spine has seven panels; second panel down: ‘Shakespeares Comedies Histories Tragedies’ (gilt); third down: ‘London 1623’ (gilt). Good condition, somewhat scuffed on its edges. Gilt decoration. All edges heavily gilded. End-papers marbled.
B. COPIES IN JAPAN

KOBE CITY

198. [Lee 38-IB] KONAN WOMEN’S UNIVERSITY
6-2-23 Morikita-cho, Higashi-nada-ku, Kobe City 658

GENERAL AND SPECIAL COMMENTS: Clean copy. Text may be perfect. Excellent condition. Described by the bookseller Rodd in 1845 as ‘cut to the quick and otherwise objectionable.’ Said in the Duke of Sussex’s catalogue to have two leaves torn. Recently [i.e., c. 1902] reported to be generally sound. Fine binding. Formerly in the J Pierpont Morgan Library. The volume was displayed, together with two Second, one Third and Two Fourth Folios (each differently bound) in a glass case in the air-conditioned rare book room.

COLLATION: (<Said to be ‘the smallest copy’ known.>) Preliminaries: [i]–[iv]. πA1–5, πA5+1–2, πA6–all clean. πA1+1 Lee says the title is <partly in facsimile>; there is a small hole just above ‘1623’.

Text: 300 x c. 197 mm. Occasionally, the top rule, and even the top of the running title, is trimmed. A glance through the text suggested it might be perfect. [v]–[viii].


Owners: (1) <Acquired c. 1820 by Duke of Sussex and sold with his library by auction, [22 April 1845 and bought by T. Evans for £5655]. [2] Purchased of Quaritch

---

53 I should like to acknowledge the great help I received from Mr Matsuo Nitta in organizing and facilitating my research visits in Japan. Through his kind assistance I was able to inspect all the known Japanese copies except Meisei 12, which arrived after my visit, and the one privately held. Mr Nitta was Chairman, Yushodo Group of Companies, Tokyo (international booksellers since 1932) and was responsible for introducing several First Folios into Japan.

Research time was very limited (a half hour at Kobe, three hours at Kyoto, two and a quarter days at Meisei). Consequently, some descriptions suffer from incompleteness and all suffer from the absence of double-checking. Perhaps an average of about two days was spent in researching and writing the Japanese descriptions, whereas a range of four to ten days was spent on the English descriptions, including a minimum of about two days examining and researching each copy.

It has been suggested that Tenri University (1050 Somanouchi, Tenri, Nara 632) has a First Folio. In fact, Tenri has a Second, a Third and a Fourth Folio, but not a First (Letter from the Library, 9 May 1991).

54 I had only brief access to this volume and did not leaf through it.

55 Table N in Appendix S/P 9. The information in this and the subsequent square brackets, within this quotation from Lee, Census—except Lee’s own reference to Winsor—is from the pencil notes on [iV].
c 1870 by Robert Lenox Kennedy, of New York. Sold in [April] 1889, with R. L. Kennedy's library, to [3] Lenox Library, New York, but disposed of as duplicate to [4] Theodore Irwine, of Oswego whose library was acquired by [5] George H Richmond, bookseller of New York, in 1890 (New York Herald 18 November 1904, 14). (6) Lee continues that Irwine's library was acquired by [J. Pierpont Morgan] in 1901 [or 1900] [Winsor, No.10]. (7) 'The copy (PML 5124) was deaccessioned in 1976, and we have finally succeeded in finding out that it was sold in 1978 to Maruzen, Tokyo'. (8) Purchased in 1978 through H P Kraus (in the USA) and Maruzen Company (in Japan) by Konan for c. $150,000.

BINDING: By Nello Nant (gold-stamp on the leather turn-in at the foot of [viii]). Red leather. Twentieth century? Perfect condition. Simple gilt decoration, front, back and spine. The spine has seven panels; second panel down: 'Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories & Tragedies' (gilt). All edges gilded. End-papers heavily marbled.

KYOTO CITY

199 [Non-Lee?] KYOTO GAIKOKU-GO (FOREIGN LANGUAGE) UNIVERSITY, 7615 Kasame - chobe, Saiin Ukyo-ku, Kyoto City

GENERAL AND SPECIAL COMMENTS: One of a set of the four seventeenth-century Folios, each bound differently. Probably a made-up copy in the nineteenth century. The leaves are a mixture of originals, probably from different volumes, and facsimiles (and possibly leaves from later folios). Many of the original leaves are damaged and rather crudely repaired. The text is seldom marred beyond a few letters. The repairs are often effected through the pasting on of transparent paper, but the text is usually discernible. Most of the blemishes are noted below; it is possible that some leaves have been wrongly called facsimile, and some facsimile leaves may have been missed.

COLLATION: Preliminaries: [i-iii] Modern binder's leaves. π A1-π A6 The paper of these leaves varies, is markedly lighter than that of the text, and, unlike the paper of the text (starting at B5), has no marks and tears. In addition, the crown watermark on A5 is much larger (50 x 63 mm) than the normal First Folio watermarks.

---

56 The information in this and the subsequent square brackets, within these quotations from Lee, Census—except Lee's own reference to Winsor—is from the pencil notes on [ivf].
58 Source: Conversation with Mr Fujimoto, Librarian, 1 August 1991.
59 I had only brief access to this volume and did not leaf through it.
60 The Second Folio in an early calf binding, the Third Folio in a modern red leather binding; the Fourth Folio I did not see.
Plate 6, placed before Part II, illustrates a First Folio crown watermark. At the foot (left) of πA1+1Γ, close to the binding, in pencil: 'Will. Shakespeare - his booke'.

Text: A1 measures 304 x c. 202 mm, but the leaves vary from this throughout the volume—usually in sets of successive pages, as one might expect in a made-up volume which has not been trimmed as a whole. A1-B4 Facsimile. No marks or tears. B5 change in paper--different texture, darker, covered with stains. It is also different from B6--more marked and damaged; possibly a single leaf from another volume. Bottom of fore-edge reinforced 134 mm. B5 tear through ll. 285-88, not obscuring text. B6-G6 are the first example of a sequence of shorter leaves (297 mm); they are trimmed as a package (very close at the top). H1-I5 Bottom margins repaired, with tears on H1-6. I6 Facsimile. K1 Short (297 mm). K2 Facsimile. K4v (column b), L5v (column a), L6r (column a), M2f (column b) Transparent paper pasted over tears top and foot. Text discernible. O3 Pen marks not obscuring text. Q2 Ink blot not obscuring text. T6v Ink blots slightly obscuring letters in ll. 2562-63. V1f Ink blots obscuring last two letters in l. 2691. X1f Repaired tear and hole touching 'onely heare' in l. 1444. X1v Repaired tear and hole with loss of words in ll. 1507-10. Z2v Marks obscuring letters in ll. 1728-29 and 1734. Z3v Marks obscuring letters in l. 1764.

b1 Ink obscuring second catch-word. B1-4 Small holes affecting a number of letters. C1-d1, d6, e1, e3-4--All? facsimile. E5r-v Transparent paper pasted, partly obscuring ll. 1433-35 and 1621-22. F1v MS note (ink)--'1606'. F2 Tear and hole at bottom margin, touching but not obscuring text. F6-g6 Shorter pages (297 mm). H1r-v Marks and words in pencil. K3 See Provenance: Data, below. Q5 Facsimile. R1-s6 are a package--same paper, size and trimming. R3 Ink obscuring end of l. 1108. R5f Repair to bottom fore-comer cutting off part of last line. T1 Facsimile. T3v Transparent paper covers most of column a. V2-4 are a package--shorter paper; top rule trimmed off.

Troilus & Cressida Paginated (printed) '1-30'. X1v Transparent paper covers top of column a and half the title. J2-4, 31 Facsimile. Aaf Transparent paper covers five lines of both columns. Bb5 Facsimile. Ee1 Whole fore-edge repaired with transparent paper, covering the beginning of all lines on the verso. Ee5v Transparent paper covers the beginning of some lines. Kk5-nn2 are a package. N6 See Provenance: Data, below. Nn3v Transparent paper covers the beginning of the bottom ten lines in column a. Nn4f Beginning of last two lines in column a obscured by a repair. Nn6 Facsimile. Oo1 Small hole affecting bottom two lines of recto column a and verso column b. Oo6v Transparent paper covers bottom four lines of column a and all of column b. Pp4v Transparent paper covers the end of ll. 3068-77. Pp5 Facsimile. Qq1f Small hole touching end of l. 3799. Ss3-vv2 Holes touching letters at the foot of the inside column. Vv2-6 Facsimile. Xx1 Hole taking letters at the foot.
of the inside column. xx2f-v Transparent paper covers almost the bottom half of each side. xx3-4 Small holes, taking letters from the top and bottom of the outside columns. xx5-6 Facsimile. yy1-6 Holes taking letters from the top and bottom of the outside columns. zz3-6 Shorter leaves. 3a2-3b6 Facsimile. [ivv] Stamp--'10073'. [vif] Pencil--'64391'. [vi].

PROVENANCE: Data: [iiv] Bottom right (pencil): 'UNDDv'. k3 Bottom margin: old hand (ink)---'Show as Johnston'. l16 Top margin: an ink signature in an old hand 'Henry ------?'; the second word is partly trimmed. [iiiV] Ink note concerning prices of two other copies, one of which was sold in 1869.

Owners: No information.

BINDING: 319 x 207 mm (including by eye the raised bands). Stamp: 'BOUND BY HAYES OXFORD' ([iiiV]). Green leather. The spine has six panels; second down: 'Shakespeare's Comedies Histories & Tragedies'; fourth down: 'London 1623.' Gilt decoration front, back and spine. Top edge only gilded.

TOKYO

MEISEI UNIVERSITY LIBRARY, Hino City, Tokyo 191

Introduction to the Meisei Copies

Meisei has the second largest collection of First Folios in the world. In general, the texts are in good condition. The University acquired its first First Folio in 1975 and now possesses twelve copies. In 1991, it had twenty-one Second, twenty Third and twenty-two Fourth Folios.61 First Folio numbers 5, 7, 8 and 10 are one of a set.62

The following table gives an overview and will facilitate references and cross-references, especially since Meisei itself uses three different numbers.

---

61 Source: Professor Toshihiko Kujirai, Meisei University Library.
62 10 August 1991 note from Professor Kujirai.
### TABLE A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>S &amp; S I, II &amp; III</th>
<th>Lee Census No.</th>
<th>One of a Set</th>
<th>Acquired</th>
<th>Reference Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MR774</td>
<td>i:2391</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td>Houghton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MR619</td>
<td>i:2392</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MR377</td>
<td>i:2393</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MR620</td>
<td>i:2394</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MR886</td>
<td>ii:3974</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MR1935</td>
<td>ii:3973</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MR1936</td>
<td>ii:3975</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Halliwell-Phillipps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MR1940</td>
<td>ii:3977</td>
<td>104?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MR1944</td>
<td>ii:3976</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milner-Vertue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>MR3570</td>
<td>iii:2457</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Cobham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MR3600</td>
<td>iii:2458</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td>Congreve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>iii:2459</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1991/92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The library possesses two descriptive lists referred to below respectively as List 1 and List 2. List 2, covering copies 1 to 11, consists of brief bibliographical details derived from the volumes themselves or from documents accompanying the volumes. It contains the coloured photograph of the eleven copies which is Plate 1 at the beginning of this work and black and white photographs of the $A1/V/A1+1$ opening of all eleven copies.

The thoroughness of the twelve descriptions which follow varies. Owing to Library constraints, it was possible to inspect, reasonably thoroughly, only copies 1, 6 and 7. Only in these copies was I able to inspect each leaf—albeit too hastily. Further, the time constraints did not permit the very necessary re-checking of details.

---

63 The Library uses this number in every day informal usage.
64 'MR' = 'Meisei Rare Books', and precedes the Library catalogue number.
65 The abbreviation, 'S & S' (Shakespeare and Shakespeariana), is employed here for convenience and is not used by the Library. See 'List of Cue Titles'.
66 Only those names are given which appear to be normally used by the Library.
67 Meisei List 1, no title, an assemblage of descriptions of Meisei First Folio copies 1 to 9, mostly photocopied from catalogues [c. 1985], with MS addenda including acquisition dates and the source from which the volume was purchased. Meisei List 2, prepared by Toshihiko Kujirai, 'The First Folios of William Shakespeare' (Kodama Memorial Library, Meisei University, Tokyo, [1991]).
68 I had previously inspected Meisei 10 and 11, when they were at booksellers in London.
Consequently, the reader is alerted to the higher than usual possibility of error. As noted in Chapter 2, the horizontal measurement of the bindings includes the curvature of the spine by eye (contrary to the norm I established later).

•200• [Lee 53, Class IIA. Lee, 1906, 5-6, promotes this copy to Class I]

**MEISEI 1** (MR 774. S & S I, 2391)

**GENERAL AND SPECIAL COMMENTS:** This copy is distinguished by having probably more underlining and marginal notes (indicating a very close reading of the plays), in an early seventeenth-century (?) secretary hand, than any other copy. Apart from the marginalia and only occasional stains, remarkably clean. Some of the marginalia touch the text. There are some small blemishes--very skilfully repaired--most of which are noted below. A note in Sotheby’s copy of Lee, *Census*, says ‘With the exception of a slight repair in the last leaf the copy is perfect and ought to be in Class I’.

**COLLATION: Preliminaries:** All clean. [i]-[iii].  **πA1** Repaired skilfully.  **πA1+1** Third state. Clean. Skilful repair just to the right of ‘London’. Second ‘N’ of ‘LONDON’ restored?  **πA2-πA5. πA6** Christie’s Catalogue (see Addendum below) says πA6 is from another copy. In Reference (1), Lee says he was incorrect in his *Census* in that πA6 is present, ‘though not in the precise place in which it is normally found’; he promotes the copy to Class I (reconfirming this, as noted in the copy heading above, in Lee, 1906, 5-6).  **πA5+1-2.**

**Text:**  333 x c. 217 mm.  **A6** Tiny hole taking part of a letter in l. 1301.  **C3^** Tiny mark touching two letters in l. 1326.  **D3^** Tiny mark obscuring a letter in l. 275.  **E1^** Ink partly obscures beginning of l. 1304.  **F4^** Tiny mark obscuring a letter in l. 929.  **g5^** Tiny mark touching two letters in l. 2438.  **M2^** Small mark obscuring four letters and touching several others.  **Q5-6** Fore-edges skilfully repaired.  **R2^** Marks obscuring letters in ll. 1464-67.  **X3^** Marks touching or covering, but not obscuring, several letters in ll. 1920-23, 1957, and 2114-18.  **bb6^** Tiny mark obscuring a letter in l. 2913.  **e1^** Tiny hole touching letters in ll. 387-88, and a tiny mark affecting letters in ll. 468 and 534.  **i1^** Tiny mark obscuring a letter in l. 1545.  **l3^** Small repair and tiny marks affecting letters in ll. 1687-88.  **m3^** Tiny mark obscuring two letters in l. 239.  **p5^** Small repair to bottom margin.  **p2^** Tiny mark obscuring a letter in l. 1115.  **p5^** Tiny mark obscuring three letters in l. 1781.  **q5^** Repaired tears affecting ll. 153-54.  **r3^** Tiny mark obscuring letters in l. 1128.  **t5^** Tiny mark obscuring two letters in l. 584.  **jj2** Small repaired tear in bottom margin.  **jj3^** Mark affecting letters in l. 2492.  **x4^** Tiny mark affecting a letter in l. 2577.  **cc2^** Hole touching and taking letters in ll. 3444-45 and 3510.  **dd2^** Hole taking letters in ll. 1039 and 1225-26.  **ee6^** Mark covering letters in l. 797.  **x4^** Tiny mark
obsuring several letters in ll. 881 and 1077. X5 White streak, from the original printing, affecting one or two letters in each of ll. 1175-76 and 1215-37. bb4-5 Bottom of fore-edges repaired. 3b6 Repairs very skilfully done to margins and bottom fore-edge corner. First part of 'Smithweeke': pen-facsimile? [iv]-[vi].


Addendum: Photocopy from Christie's Catalogue, 11 June 1980—see Owners (7).


References: (1) Sidney Lee, 'Mr Lee's “Census of Shakespeare First Folios”', Athenæum, 4081 (January 1906), 52. (2) Akihiro Yamada, Meisei University, is working on a transcript of the marginalia, due to be published in 1998.

BINDING: (In folding box in red morocco pull-off case.) 337 x 219 mm. '17c calf (rebacked and repaired, preserving original spine)' (Addendum). Worn, but in good condition. Seven panels. Two blind rules around edges of front and back, partly obscured by wear. No title.

69 Compact Edition William Shakespeare First Folio 1623, with Introduction by Professor Mitsuo Kodama, Director Kodama Memorial Library, Meisei University (Tokyo, 1985), xii—referred to hereafter as Compact. This facsimile edition is described below in Appendix I, 'Facsimile Editions of the First Folio'. 
GENERAL AND SPECIAL COMMENTS: Clean copy all through. Light staining.

COLLATION: Preliminaries: [i]-[iii]. πA1 From a Second Folio (see Addendum (2) below). πA1+1 Clean and complete, but closely trimmed and mounted on a non-original leaf with a pen rule all round it. πA2-6 All clean.


PROVENANCE: Data: [iV'] Bookplate: ‘Earl . of . Aylesford Packington. Warwicks.’ [iiv'] Bookplates: ‘John William Pease’ and ‘Howard Pease, Otterburn Tower, Northumberland’. [iiv'] Tipped in: a MS note (ink) from Packington Hall, Coventry, with ‘[Apr 1888]’ added in pencil: ‘Lord Aylsford [sic] has no idea where the Shakespeare Messrs Bowden & Co bought at the sale of the Aylsford library came from but it was certainly not bought by the Earl as it has been in the library for many years. April 9th 88.’ On the bottom half of [iiv'](?), notes in pencil regarding this copy, and a separate note (pencil): ‘Glass [Case?] Shelf 31’.

[iiiV'] Tipped in: (1) A note on paper headed ‘Pendower, Newcastle Upon Tyne’ includes: ‘[πA1] in this volume was taken from the 2nd edition (1632) (which belonged to Dr Samuel Johnson) by Ld Aylesford who sold both books at Christie’s at the same time. The first edition being bought by Mr Bowden . . . and the 2nd by Mr. Nattali for Mr. Henry Irving’. (2) Letter from Quaritch, 18 November 1918, to Howard Pease Esq: note at the top of it in red ink: ‘Dec 1939. Quaritch offered me when he saw it £2000. I insured it for £2500 April 22nd 1925.’ The Quaritch letter itself says in part: ‘. . . we did not supply it, but at the sales in 1888 it fetched £200. . . . Your description that the portrait . . . is inlaid is not in accordance with the notes I have of your copy, nor with the description in the sale cat. where it is described as having the entire title inlaid. I should think that £1500--£1800 would be a fair value.’ (3) A clipping from The Times, ‘Apr 20 1921’ (1926?), refers to the sale of a First Folio (12 7/8 x 8 3/8) at Quaritch’s for £4,200.

[iiiV'] Top left corner (pencil): ‘MR619 No. 2’. Three clippings pasted to a sheet of paper that is tipped in: (1) ‘N’c Journal March 16, 1888—referring to a ‘cluster of people at Christie’s new gallery’π this afternoon when the Shakespeare folios from the

---

70 I did not leaf through this volume.
71 Information on the text—and quotation—from Addendum 5.
72 Compare Meisei 11, Provenance, Owners (a), footnote.
Packington library were knocked down. Present were Ld and Lady Aylesford. The first edition brought £200, the buyer being a newly established bookseller, Mr. Bowden, who had to compete with Mr. Quaritch for it. [The second edition, with notes of Lewis Theobald and annotations of Dr Johnson,] brought £140'. (2) 'Nc Journal March 17/88': saying that Mr. Nattali who had purchased the Second Folio 'yesterday' was representing Mr. Irving'. (3) 'Mar 17/88' clipping from the Standard, referring to the previous day's sale.

Addenda: (1) Cuttings from The Times: 17 December 1919 refers to the Britwell Library sale and a day of record prices. 12 December 1919 refers to the 'sale next month of Rare Books from Arbury Hall' including Lee 52. (2) Letter (dated 6 February—no year—Bidborough, Nr. Tunbridge Wells) to Mrs Cherry-Garrard, signed 'Norma Hodgson' (presumably Norma Russell, the editor and bibliographer of William Cowper), suggesting the addressee come, 'with your husband, to hear Dr Boas . . . at the Royal Society of Literature on Wed. Feb. 16'. The letter has a postscript: ‘As regards yr folios [sic] I see that in the catalogue entry we said that the leaf of lines “To the Reader” in [the First Folio] was apparently taken from Lord Aylesford’s copy of the Second Folio which had formerly belonged to Dr Johnson’. (3) Three paragraphs—typed—the first two about the First Folio in general, the third: ‘This copy can be traced through its bookplates and pedigree from the 18th century to its last previous owner, Apsley Cherry-Garrard, the Antarctic explorer.’ (4) 4 July 1923 article (from ?), celebrating Incunabula and the First Folio. (5) From a catalogue, item 26: the entry is for this volume, price £14,000, and gives a brief description. (6a) Invoice dated 5 June 1978 from John Howell — Books, San Francisco to Yushodo Booksellers, Tokyo, certifying the genuineness of this volume. (6b) A description of this volume (nd, but presumably 1978) on paper headed 'John Howell -- Books'.

Owners: (1) <Acquired c 1850 by the Earl of Aylesford.> Lee gives no evidence for the 'c 1850'. According to the note tipped in at [ii^], the Earl who sold the volume in 1888 had 'certainly' not bought it himself, 'as it had been in the library for many years'. (2) Sold at the sale of the Earl of Aylesford's library at Christie's, March 1888, for £200. Bought by Messrs Bowden & Co (Items 1 and 2, tipped in at [iii^] and item 1 tipped in at [ii^]). It is unclear to whom they sold it. (3) <Acquired [unclear from whom or when] by present owner's husband, who died in 1901.> (4) Owner in Lee, Census: Mrs J W Pease, Pendower, Newcastle-Upon-Tyne. (5) Owner in November 1918 and December 1939^3 (Quaritch letter, tipped in at [iii^]): Howard Pease, Otterburn Tower, Northumberland (Bookplate, [ii^]). (6) Acquired by Apsley

^3 A note in Sotheby's copy of Lee, Census, says: 'Passed to Howard Pease, F. S. A. He died in 1928 & left his set of the 4 Folios as Heirlooms'.
Cherry-Garrard, the Antarctic explorer (Addenda 2 and 3), from Hodgson and Co, 12 May 1948, with Second Third and Fourth Folios for £7,100 (BAR 45, 519). Unclear to whom or when he sold it. (7) In June 1978, John Howell—Books, San Francisco, invoiced (8) Yushodo Booksellers, Tokyo. (9) It became the property of Meisei in the same month.

Reference: Note in Quaritch’s copy of Lee, Census: ‘1948 Cherry-Garrard. Offered him 7000 for this copy 27.1.192[?]0. = Meisei 1981’

BINDING: 319 x 203 mm. Staggemeier and Welsher. Good condition. Slightly scuffed. ‘Late 18c straight-grained red morocco with geometric design stamped in gilt on sides, spine gilt-lettered’ (Addendum 6b). The spine has six panels; second down: ‘Shakespeare’; third down: ‘First Edition’; bottom: ‘1623’. All edges gilded. Endpapers dark brown, with double gilt rule around the edge of each leaf (at the front, framing the bookplates).


It is not Lee 105 as stated in List 2. The identity of this and several other relevant volumes is clarified in Chapter 4, ‘Following the Trails of Elusive Copies’: ‘Trails of Lee 105/Landau/Folger77/Meisei 3/Wesleyan’, where Table A compares details of Lee 105 and Meisei 3. The signature of James Lakin on d5\textsuperscript{F} of Meisei 3 is present in the copy sold at Sotheby’s on 13 July 1948 and again on 26 August 1959. The catalogues for both of these sales refer to the signature of James Lakin ‘at the end of Richard the Second’, ie, on d5\textsuperscript{F}, and show that the volume is the Horace de Landau copy, not recorded in Lee, Census, but noted by Lee in Lee, 1924, 101.


Text: 328 x c. 203 mm. A1 has variant signature B. A number of leaves have blemishes; some examples, with no claim of being exhaustive, follow: A1\textsuperscript{F}-\textsuperscript{V} Tiny hole touching ‘dearest’ in l. 82 and ‘Mother’ in l. 148. S4\textsuperscript{F} Small hole touching ‘I’ in l. 452. VV1\textsuperscript{V} Small hole touching ‘y’ of ‘story’ in l. 2517. 3b3\textsuperscript{V} Mark obscures letters of last word in l. 3157. 3b5-6 Repaired. (‘Lower margin of last 2 ff

\textsuperscript{74} I did not leaf through this volume.
mended'—De Ricci slip). In addition, Sotheby's Cat (25 November 1974) notes: 'Small restorations to \texttt{dd4, gg1, gg3, hh4, and nn1-2} with loss of a few letters in some cases, a few rust-holes and other minor flaws in the text, a few leaves remargined.' List 2 says 'Last 2 leaves in facsimile'.

**PROVENANCE:** Data:75 [iii[i]] '377 MR No. 3'. d5\textsuperscript{F} Signature: 'James Lakin'; two of Sotheby's catalogues say the signature is eighteenth century—See Owners (4) and (5); another says it is nineteenth century—See Owners (6).

**Owners:** (1) Possibly owned by James Lakin (unidentified). (2) 'Belonged about 1880 to Pickering & Co. Obtained before 1885 by [Baron] Horace de Landau [1824-1903], Florence . . . for £450 with the three other Folios; now belongs to his niece, Mme Ugo Finly, Villa Alla Pietra, Florence . . .' (De Ricci slip). The library formed by Horace de Landau was maintained and augmented by Madame Finly (d 1938) of Florence. (3) 'In the fine library of Mme Finely [sic] at the Villa Landau [Florence]; I am told it is in good condition' (Lee 1924, 101). (4) It was sold at Sotheby's 13 July 1948, together with the Second to Fourth Folios (lot 107), 'the only English books in the sale' (Sotheby's Cat Preface, last sentence). The set was bought by Maggs for £1900 (Sotheby's Cat). 'The name, James Lakin, . . . is written in an 18th Century hand at the end of Richard the Second . . . [The set is] uniformly bound in red morocco gilt, g. e. . . . The binding is signed by Riviere for Pickering & Co.' (Sotheby's Cat).76 (5) The First Folio (lot 237) in the Sotheby's sale on 26/7 October 1959 had the 'signature' (18th Cent.) of James Lakin', and was the 'property of Frederick McDonald Hall and R C Hall' (Sotheby's Cat). Its binding was 'Mor. gt.' and it was bought by '[Lionel and Philip] Robinson [booksellers Pall Mall] . . . for £1,300' (BAR 57, 496). (6) The First Folio (lot 3166) in the Sotheby's sale on 25/26 November 1974, had the 'nineteenth-century signature of James Lakin on d5 recto.' (Sotheby's Cat). Its binding was 'Mor by Riviere', and it was bought by Fleming for £12,000 (ABPC 81, 893). (7) Purchased by Meisei in 'February, 1975, at a book fair held in Japan that year' (Compact, ix).

**Reference:** Fr Roediger, ed, *Catalogue des Livres Manuscrits et Imprimés Composant la Bibliothèque de M Horace de Landau*, 2 vols (Florence, 1885), t, 439. There is an entry for each of the four seventeenth-century Folios (439-40).

**BINDING:** 356 x 213 mm. Stamps ([iii[i]]): 'Bound by Riviere' / 'For Pickering & Co'. Red morocco; slightly scuffed. Gilt decoration front, back and spine. The spine

---

75 S \& S, Vol I, 113, is in error saying that this copy has the 'Barron Field bookplate' (cf Meisei Copy Number 4).

76 Information on the Lakin signature and the binding is repeated in Owners (5) and (6) to corroborate the identity of the volume.
has seven panels; second down: 'Shakespeare'; third down: 'London 1623'. All edges gilded. End-papers marbled.

203• [Non-Lee] MEISEI 477 (MR620. S & S I, 2394)

GENERAL AND SPECIAL COMMENTS: Clean copy, with very few marks and almost no holes.

COLLATION: Preliminaries (Data from List 2): Lacks πA1 and πA5. πA1+1 In facsimile. πA2 From Second Folio.

Text: 315 x c. 202 mm. 'Some leaves repaired and a few small portions of the text restored in pen-facsimile. Some leaves stained' (Addendum). The following exemplify the blemishes. A1-4 Tear repaired. A1 Reinforced at gutter margin and bottom fore-corner. A2 Bottom edge reinforced. H3-H4 Edges of leaves supplied, with text completed in pen-facsimile on the outside columns on both rectos and versos. M3-4 From Second Folio (List 2). X1-3 Small hole affecting letters in ll. 1587, 1844 and 2100. X3 Top fore-corner repaired affecting text in ll. 1943-49 and 2008-14. Y3-4 From Second Folio (List 2). r2 Bottom fore-corner repaired. r5f Tear repaired at the bottom of column b; 'n' of 'thank' completed in pen-facsimile. r6 Stain and small hole affecting ends of ll. 1743-44, with loss of some letters. 3b1 Bottom margin repaired. 3b2-6 In facsimile. [iv]-[vi].


Addendum: Notes in pen regarding variants and the condition of the volume, and identifying the bookplate: 'Bookplate of Barron Field, friend of Lamb, Coleridge, Wordsworth and Leigh Hunt, Judge of the Supreme Court of New South Wales, and author of First Fruits of Australian Poetry'. He also 'edited several plays for the Shakespeare Society'.79

Owners: (1) Barron Field (1786-1846). It is unclear whether Barron Field had the volume in Australia with him. (2) Sir Thomas Phillipps (1792-1872) acquired the

77 I did not leaf through this copy.
78 List 2 incorrectly spells this ‘Baron’.
79 A N L Munby, Phillipps Studies No. 4: The Formation of the Phillipps Library 1841 to 1872 (Cambridge, 1956), 17.
volume at the sale of Barron Field, Sotheby's, 20 July 1846.  
(3) ‘Now in the collection of Mr D. M. Colman’.  
The ‘now’ was presumably c. 1955, the date of Munby’s preface to his Phillipps Studies No. 4.  
(4) Acquired 31 October 1978 by Meisei, from Yushodo Booksellers (List 1).

BINDING:  328 x 205 mm. Brown leather; scuffed, but good condition. The spine has seven panels; second panel down: ‘Shakespeare Works’; bottom: ‘1623’. Front, back and spine: gilt rules and rosettes.

GENERAL AND SPECIAL COMMENTS:  Clean copy all through, with few or no marginalia, marks or holes. One of a set of the four Folios (List 1).

COLLATION:  Preliminaries: [i]-[iii].  
(A) A1 and (A) A1+1 In facsimile (List 1).  
(One hair on the silhouette of the head is loose—not just one stray hair.)  
(A) A2-A5.  
(A) A5+1-2 In facsimile.  
(A) A6. Preliminaries clean, with skilful repairs. (One other preliminary is in facsimile--List 1).  
(A) A2-A3 are paginated (pencil): ‘3-14’.

Text: 319 x c. 207 mm. Examples of blemishes include the following.  
(A) A1-B2  
Extensive but skilful repairs to margins and corners; the text is affected on a number of leaves and is completed in pen-facsimile on others.  
(A) 16-3b5 For all these leaves, from the beginning of Macbeth to the penultimate leaf of Cymbeline, all fore-margins and some bottom margins are reinforced; the text is sometimes affected, especially, for example, on the outside edges of the outside columns on mm1.  
(A) 3b6 In facsimile.  
(iii)-[vi].

PROVENANCE:  Data: [i] Top left corner (pencil)–‘MR 886 No. 5 Lee 67’.  
[v] (Pencil–‘932.141 / Sh 12 / 1623 /5’).

Addenda:  There are four addenda, none (except for the emblem referred to below) with new information. The first three are display cards for an exhibition. The fourth gives brief bibliographical details. Two of the first three cards bear an emblem of a ‘C’ intertwined with a ‘U’, with the letters ‘N’, ‘I’, ‘O’ ‘N’ placed respectively where the arms of the two letters intersect.


•205• [Lee 22, Class IB] MEISEI 6 (MR1935. S & S II, 3973)

GENERAL AND SPECIAL COMMENTS: There are small blemishes, most of which are noted below. Condition of leaves varies throughout the volume, some being both completely clean and completely unstained, while others have marginalia, stains and repairs (some skilful, some rather crude).


Text: 330 x c. 205 mm. A1-E1 About the top quarter of each gutter margin reinforced. A1-B6 Each bottom fore-edge corner reinforced (c. 22 x 115 mm maximum). A4 Tear between original and reinforcement. B2 Tear near gutter margin at top. B6 Tear at bottom of gutter margin. F1' Tiny hole taking part or all of two letters (l. 40). F1' Same hole, taking or touching two letters (ll. 213-14). I1 At l. 1548, penned: "^A [referring to another "^A after 'moodie'] moping ??? or muling. T. H'. K4 c. 45 mm of fore-edge missing near the bottom. L3' Marks (ink) in fore-margin. Small hole, touching two letters and taking most of 'CI' of 'Clo' (ll. 450-51). M2' Marks in gutter margin. N1' O3' (ie, all of Midsummer Night's Dream) Many notes (mostly in the margins and few touching the text) 'correcting' the text in ink. O5' One more 'correction'. After this, the leaves are completely unmarked again. P3' Mark obscuring first 'to' in l. 1487. Q6 and S4 Small amount of bottom fore-corner missing. X2' and X5' At the top of these leaves the paper was creased at the time of printing, affecting the text. X5' Mark affecting two letters (l. 2530). Z1' Mark affecting two letters (l. 1451). Aa1 Small amount of bottom margin missing. Aa4 Small amount of bottom fore-corner missing.
b6 Stain affecting letters in l. 36, and a short tear in gutter margin. d1 Black dot covers 'ex' of 'exit' (l. 1913). f1-2 'Washed and possibly supplied from another copy' (Addendum 1). f2 Tiny hole, touching a letter in l. 2372. Small tear at the bottom of the outside column. xgg4 Tiny hole taking '?' from l. 2387 and part of 'o' of 'of' in l. 2580. xgg5 Tiny hole affecting 'i' of 'if' in l. 2678. xgg5v Tiny hole and stain affecting 'o' of 'out' in l. 2867. xgg8 Tear from bottom inside corner. h6f Tiny mark affecting 'W' in 'Wickednesse' (l. 1281). i2 Tiny hole touching l. 1812 and l. 2005. n2f Pen note in bottom margin crossed out. q5v Stain partly obscuring 'the course' (l. 208). q6f Stain affecting l. 273. s4f 'oph' from 'prophecie' (l. 2695, s3v) has offset and partly obscures 'Rich' of 'Richmond' in l. 2756.

X 2 Loss of small part of bottom fore-corner. f2 Tiny hole touching ll. 717 and 915. f4 Tiny hole taking last 'e' of 'vengeance' (l. 1221), and part of 'w' and 'h' in 'How he' (l. 1416). fff4 Tiny hole taking part of 'er' in 'there' (l. 2864) and 'a' in 'care' (l. 2929). dd3f-v Crease in paper, affecting bottom lines of outside columns. 'About forty words . . . very skilfully restored from another genuine copy' (List 1). mm1v Small blot affecting 'ee' in 'see' (l. 445). mm2f Four small blots affecting several letters. mm3v Blot touching l. 927. qq2f-v, qq3f MS notes (ink) in text and margins. ss1 MS word inserted (ink). ss4 Small blot touching l. 195. tt1v Stain touching l. 1037. tt2f Stain touching l. 1226. vv4f Rust mark obscuring 'H' of 'How' (l. 3200). 3a6f 'Lower fore-corner . . . very skilfully restored with the catchword lost and with short bits of the border-rules supplied with pen and ink' (List 1). 3a6v Stain touching ll. 2360-63. 3b3v Stain affecting l. 3233. 3b4f Stain affecting ll. 3265-68. [v]-[viii].


BINDING: (Boxed in red levant solander case, with ‘William Shakespeare/London, 1623’.) 333 x 215 mm. ‘18c calf tooled in blind, the spine elaborately gilt, red edges’ (Addendum 1). Scuffed with worn corners. The spine has six panels; second down: ‘Shakespeare Works’.

GENERAL AND SPECIAL COMMENTS: Text very clean and lacking only one original leaf. Scarcely any marginalia or stains. Some leaves repaired, some have a wash of white. Most of the blemishes are noted below, showing how few and minor they are. Regarding condition, see Halliwell-Phillipps’s positive comments below (Data [iii], item 3). Fine binding. One of a set of the four Folios.


---

85 John M Robertson (1856-1933), MP, noted for his ‘wide . . . range of significant knowledge’, his histories of free thought, his distinction as a literary critic, and as ‘as one of the leading Shakespearean scholars of his time’ (DNB 1931-40 (1949)).

84 10 August 1991 note from Professor Kujira
Text: 317 x c. 203 mm. A1f Repaired tear through bottom three lines (inside column); it does not touch the text on the verso. A2 Top and bottom margins repaired. Bottom fore-corner replaced; repair touches bottom line of outside column on verso. A3-4 Top and bottom margins repaired. F1 MS note (very light ink) in bottom margin. L7*-Y These pages are an extreme example of the wash of white. M3 Tiny hole repaired affecting ll. 2001-12 and 2065-66. P2 Repaired tear passing through ll. 1110-12. Z4 Tiny hole removing a letter in l. 2213. b3f Tiny blot touching ll. 2055-56. xgg3 is shorter (305 mm) and has a tiny hole affecting l. 2352. k6 A stain not obscuring the text. 12 Bottom fore-corner replaced affecting l. 1496. 14 Stain; tiny hole affecting two words in l. 1937 and last word of l. 2125. m Top half of inner margin reinforced.85
dd5 Hole taking letters from ll. 1867 and 1932. ee2 Fore and bottom margins reinforced. ee5 Bottom corner, c.127 x c. 125 mm, replaced; rather poorly joined on so that ll. 551-558 are mismatched. It is not the original corner as there is some duplication of letterpress at the join between ll. 599 and 600. gg2 Repaired tear touching l. 2976. hh4 Bottom margin repaired. Il4 Tiny hole affecting two letters in l. 2333 and a letter in l. 2524. nn3 Bottom and fore margins reinforced. pp1 Repaired tear passing through ll. 2234, 2298 and 2427-28. ss5 Corner replaced incorporating from the outside columns the bottom twenty-three lines (from l. 447) on the recto and the bottom twenty lines (from l. 514) on the verso, and extending slightly into the inside columns, especially on the verso. ss6 Bottom margin reinforced. xx6f Repaired tear passing through l. 1460. 3b1 Top and bottom fore-corners repaired. 3b2 Top margin reinforced. 3b3 Fore-corners and part of fore-edge repaired. 3b4-5 Margins repaired. 3b6 Facsimile. (See Halliwell-Phillipps’s judgement below on the excellence of the facsimile—Data [iii]v, item 3.) [iv]-[vi].


[iii] (1) Top left (pencil): ‘MR 1936/No. 7’. (2) Top right (ink): ‘Henry H. Gibbs/St Dunstans’ and (pencil): ‘(Lord Aldenham)’. (3) MS note (ink), signed ‘J. O. H[alliwell-Phillipps]’. The note begins by discussing how the price of the First

---

85 I did not note which leaf in the quire.
Folio has increased since its publication and continues: 'The present, a very fair copy, is perfect with the exception of three leaves, which leaves have been beautifully facsimiled. The last leaf which is a facsimile, is so well executed as almost to defy detection except to a very practised eye. The volume is for all purposes as useful as one quite perfect, every page being in it as in the original. The preliminary leaves are very seldom found in such good condition. J. O. H.' (4) Note (ink) regarding the prices of Beresford-Hope's four Folios at Sotheby's, [23] March 1882. (5) and (6) Two cuttings from a catalogue.

Addendum: A loose note concerning this copy's provenance, with a negative comment on John Fleming, signed 'B. K. P. Esq.' 86


BINDING: (Box covered quarter brown leather and cloth.) 331 x 208 mm. Fine binding in good condition, though scuffed at the corners. 'Full green levant morocco, elaborately tooled back and sides, c 1850' (List 1). The spine has six panels; second down: 'The Plays of Shakespeare.'; fifth down: 'The First Edition.'; bottom: 'London 1623.' All edges gilded. End-papers marbled.

86 In August 1991, the note was located at b3V.
GENERAL AND SPECIAL COMMENTS: The identity of this volume and the '?' after Lee 104 are dealt with in Chapter 4, 'Dealing with Doubtful Identifications': 'Lee 104 and Meisei 8 (Table E)'. 'A made-up copy, incorporating leaves from at least 5 copies . . . and with more than half the leaves showing at least minor repairs. . . . Apart from aaaB and the colophon leaf, none of the leaves present has serious textual defects, although 25 other leaves have a few letters missing or damaged (in most cases supplied or restored by pen) . . . There are few annotations' (PB). One of a set of the four Folios.

COLLATION: 'Most of the leaves from the beginning of the text through zz5 are from a single copy, which also apparently supplied aaa3-4 and possibly one or more of the preliminary leaves. A second copy supplied a fragment used to repair aaa3, and possibly also the fragmentary final leaf. Leaf aaa6 is from a third copy, and bears ink annotations not paralleled elsewhere in this copy. A fourth copy, whose leaves had been bleached but inadequately washed, supplied two preliminary leaves. At least 24 other leaves come from at least one other copy: probably more than one, since while some of them are remargined at the head but intact at the foot, others are intact at the head and remargined at the foot. . . . Some 25 pages (mostly in Othello and Antony) have fairly discreet marginal marks in pencil (usually large dots), and there are a few pencil marks in blank spaces inside the rule-frames. Only once is the pencil found at work on the text itself: Hamlet's "solid flesh" speech on nn5v has been extensively marked, mostly by underlining' (PB).

Preliminaries: All are clean. [i]-[iv]. πA1 'Lithographic facsimile on paper with fleur-de-lys watermark (possibly late 17th, but probably 18th century). The ink-colour and general appearance of this differ somewhat from the two other facsimile leaves in the preliminaries' (PB). πA1+1: 'Lithographic facsimile. At first sight the engraved portrait appears to be inlaid or mounted, suggesting that at least part of the leaf is genuine. In fact, however, close inspection shows beyond question that the patch of paper that almost coincides with the size and position of the portrait was pasted on to the leaf before it was printed' (PB). The leaf is tipped to a new inner margin. πA2-4: Inlaid. πA2 and πA4 have First Folio watermarks. πA5 'Mounted—very expertly. The two printed areas of the original leaf (Holland's signature is mounted as

---

87 I did not leaf through this copy. My own description of this copy (and of Meisei 9) has been considerably amplified with details from Peter Blayney's description, 'Report on the Condition of Two Copies of the Shakespeare First Folio [now Meisei 8 and 9]' (Unpublished, May 1985), which was written before the volumes left the USA and which he generously gave me. Substantial borrowings are in quotations and followed by 'PB'.

88 10 August 1991 note from Professor Kujira.

89 πA1+1 of Meisei 10 also has a fleur-de-lys watermark.
a separate fragment) have been rubbed so thin from the verso that even with through-lighting it is not easy to realize that what looks like slight discoloration is in fact an almost transparently thin overlay: the chains and wires of the original leaf are undetectable. Microscopic examination of the lettering, though, demonstrates that the text is intact (apart from a "y" descender in the last line of the verse), with no facsimile restoration or retouching' (PB). \( \pi A5+1 \) 'Mounted, and urgently needing first aid from a conservator. This leaf and \( \pi A6 \) are not from the same copy as \( \pi A2-4 \), and they had been bleached (and probably also mounted) before being incorporated in this copy. The bleach has destroyed the paper fibres, and both leaves are disintegrating. Some print has already been lost' (PB). \( \pi A5+2 \) Lithographic facsimile. \( \pi A6 \) Mounted; the note to \( \pi A5+1 \) above applies also to \( \pi A6 \).

**Text:** 308 x c. 207 mm. 'This copy has the early state of the following: A1\( ^v \), K2\( ^v \), L5\( ^f \), S5\( ^v \) (state 2 of 3), m3\( ^r \), q4\( ^v \), dd2\( ^v \), dd4\( ^t \), dd6\( ^v \), ee1\( ^v \), ee3\( ^v \), ee4\( ^r \), ee5\( ^f \) and xx6\( ^v \) (PB).

90 Most of the leaves in this copy are cropped and/or remargined and/or strengthened at the bottom corner, and/or have mended tears, but with text intact. **Comedies:** I3, P2, R4-6, T6 and Y1-2 have damaged or missing letters. C3-4, K2, K4-5, N2, Y1 Supplied from another copy or copies. **Histories:** xgg4 and 14 have damaged or missing letters. r5 and s1 Supplied from another copy. **Tragedies:** pp3-4, zz5, and 3b2-4 have damaged or missing letters. 'gg3', gg2-3, hh2-3, pp3-4, zz6, 3a1-2, 3a5 and bb1-6 Supplied from other copies. 3a3 is repaired with a fragment of a second original leaf, itself defective and restored by pen. 3b6 is largely in facsimile but with an original fragment inlaid; this leaf is individually tipped to the binding; the sewing can be seen to start with 3b5. [v]-[viii].

**PROVENANCE:** Data: [i\( ^v \)] Bookplate of Wentworth Buller. [ii\( ^r \)] Top fore-corner label: 'E 7'. [ii\( ^v \)] Top fore-corner MS: (1) '3[?] / 276'. (2) 'MR 1940 NO. 8'. (3) MS erased. [iii\( ^r \)] MS erased, which once read: 'Two Hundred and Fifty Pounds'. [vi\( ^v \): Stamp: 'Library Meisei University'.

**Owners:** If this is Lee 104: (1) <Bought c 1860 of Pickering, London, by S. Rider, bookseller of Providence, who sold it to [2] C. Fiske Harris of that city. (Winsor, No. 6.) After Fiske Harris's death, it was sold in 1883 to [3] a collector in Kentucky>. Whether or not it is Lee 104: (1) Wentworth Buller ([i\( ^v \)]) . (2) Lord Aster [sic] (List 2). (3) Purchased by Meisei in 1985 from John F Fleming (List 1).

**BINDING:** 320 x 212 mm. Full red morocco. <Riviere?>? Almost perfect condition, though corners worn. Gilt tooled. The spine has seven panels; second down: 'Shakespeare.' third down: 'London 1623.' All edges gilded, end-papers marbled.
GENERAL AND SPECIAL COMMENTS: S & S II erroneously claims this to be 'The tallest copy now extant'. Fine binding. 'I1' has been extensively repaired, most of the repairs consisting of mends, reinforcements, and re-marginings undertaken in preference to trimming. In 83 leaves there is damage affecting the text, although in most cases only a few letters are damaged or missing. There is little annotation. and there are about a dozen early scribbles and doodles in ink' (PB). One of only three recorded copies containing the uncorrected state of forme R1^5^6^v^ and like the other two copies it also contains the corrected state. 'At least 6 leaves (including R2:5, mentioned above) are supplied from at least 2 other copies' (PB).

COLLATION: Preliminaries: [i]-[iii]. A1 Facsimile. A1+1 Facsimile, with 'platemark' added around the portrait by pen. A2^r Inlaid, defective at head and (especially) foot, and restored in pen-facsimile as follows: right end of head-ornament repaired; several letters supplied and retouched in ll. 20-25; parts of ll. 26-27 and most of l. 28 supplied; signature and catchword supplied. A2^v Most of headline supplied; several letters supplied and retouched in ll. 1-3; parts of subscription supplied. A3 Inlaid, defective at head and foot, restored in pen-facsimile as follows: head-ornament repaired; substantial parts of ll. 37-40 supplied; signature and subscription supplied. A4^r Inlaid, slightly defective at head. A4^v Ornament and many letters in ll. 1 partly restored by pen. A5 Inlaid. A5+1 Remargined at foot and fore-edge, head rules slightly damaged at extreme right. This and the next leaf have yellowish-brown stains. A5+2 Remargined at foot and fore-edge. A6 Remargined at head, foot and fore-edge. Head and fore rules slightly damaged and restored by pen. An early hand has added: 'The Tragedie of Troylus & Cressida'. 'If all the extant preliminary leaves are original to this copy (as seems likely), the progressive improvement in condition from A2 through A1 suggests that this leaf was originally bound between A5 and [FB]1, as in the “ideal” collation' (PB).

Text: 340 x c. 216 mm. 'This copy has the early state of B3^v^, L5^f^, R1^f^, R6^v^, m3^f^, dd2^f^, dd2^v^, dd5^v^, dd6^v^, Gg2^v^, pp5^f^, qq6^f^ and rr1^1^v^ (PB). Comedies: N3^r^ (l. 532) an early hand has corrected 'say' to 'sawe'. R2 and R5 are supplied from another, smaller copy. R2 and S2 have damaged or missing letters restored by pen. Ce2^f^ MS

91 I did not leaf through this copy. My own description of this copy (as of Meisei 8) has been considerably amplified with details from Peter Blayney's description, which was made before the volume left the USA, and which he generously gave me. Substantial borrowings are in quotations and followed by 'PB'.
92 The erroneous claim probably arose from the dropping of the word 'Private' in the phrase 'The Tallest in Private Hands'. This phrase is from List 1, which seems to be from a bookseller's description. The honour of 'the tallest' goes to Folger 1--343 x 220 mm.
93 The other two are West 149 and 166.
in the margin: 'mary chapman'. Twenty-one leaves have damaged or missing letters, not restored. Four leaves have damaged rules; 104 have repaired corners and/or edges. twenty-three leaves are undamaged and unrepaired. ** Histories: b3-4 and **gg4-5 are supplied from at least one other copy, possibly from two different copies. **gg4 and m2 have substantial loss of text, restored by pen. Nine leaves have damaged or missing letters, not restored; six have damaged or missing letters restored by pen. Five leaves have damaged rules; 107 have repaired corners and/or edges. Three leaves are undamaged and unrepaired.

** Tragedies:24  jj3f (l. 2562) in an early hand: 'the trumpet sounds'. ee4, mm3, and tt2 have damaged or missing letters, not restored. gg1f MS at the foot: 'ann shor' (last letter possibly 'c' or 't'). xx1-5 Fore-edge remargined, extending along parts of head and foot. Printed area damaged in top corner, affecting rules and up to three letters in the first line in column a of each verso (restored in pen). xx6-zz6 Remargined as xx1-5, but extending further along head and foot. Damage in top corner (usually restored by pen) affects one or more of the page-numbers and up to four lines at the beginning of each verso; damage at the foot (usually restored) is confined to recto catchwords and the beginnings of one or two lines at the bottom of the verso outer column. Headlines remain intact except on zz3. 3a1-6 Remargined at fore-edge, along part of foot, and along more than half the head. Damage to corners not much more extensive than in yy-zz, but fore-edge damage affects numerous peripheral letters, especially in the upper half. 3b1 Fore-edge and head fully remargined and foot partly so. Fore-edge damage affects one or more letters in nearly all lines in verso column a, especially in upper half. 3b2-3 Remargined at head, fore-edge and foot. Fore-edge rule and marginal letters completely missing and restored by pen, with more serious losses in the first eight lines in the outer column of the verso. 3b4-5 Inlaid. Fore-edge damaged as in 3b2-3, but more substantial losses in upper half (in places extending more than an 25 mm into the text). 3b6 Inlaid. Most of ll. 3760-67 and part of l. 3768 missing, and supplied by pen. Beginnings of most other lines in column a damaged and restored by pen, as are the headline, part of the ornament and part of the first line of the colophon. In total (excluding 3b2-6), thirty-two leaves have damaged or missing letters restored by pen; eighteen have damaged rules, but text intact; 102 have repaired corners and/or edges, but printed area intact; and one leaf is undamaged and unrepaired.

PROVENANCE: Data: [iiV] MS (pencil): 'Size 13 7/16 inches by 8 1/2'. [iiiF] Top left: 'MR 1944 no. 9' and pencil note concerning 'the indisputable honour of being the tallest copy now extant'.

24 All of this paragraph is drawn from PB's description.


GENERAL AND SPECIAL COMMENTS: Text unimpaired throughout. A continuous provenance from c. 1660 to the present. Belonging to a set of four Folios assembled between c. 1810 (First Folio) and 1880 (Fourth Folio). Each volume bears the Hagley Hall bookplate. The set was offered for sale for the first time in 1990 (See Provenance, below).  \( \pi A1 \), letterpress of  \( \pi A1+1 \) and  \( 3b5-6 \) in facsimile by Burt (Lee, Census, copy 74).\(^\text{95}\) No other evidence of making up. Some marginal repairs throughout (see Reference, below).

COLLATION: Preliminaries: [i]-[v].  \( \pi A1 \) Facsimile.  \( \pi A1+1 \) ‘Genuine, but assembled from two different originals, the portrait [State 3] very skilfully “married” to the original letterpress text . . . . Our description of . . . a “marriage” . . . was based on a letter to the family from an expert in the conservation department at the British Library who examined the book on their behalf. We are now of the opinion that the portrait is genuine but the letterpress text is all in (very good) facsimile’ (see Reference, below)—ie, Quaritch agrees with Lee. I do not agree that the portrait is original--at least it is not printed on normal First Folio paper. The watermark, which is very clearly visible on the verso, is much larger (measuring about 73 x 50 mm at its widest) than the norm. The tallest of nineteen betaradiographs which I have from West 31 at the Bodleian

measures about 45 mm and the widest about 50 mm. Further, all nineteen of the betaradiographs are crowns, whereas this portrait's watermark is in the form of a vase, with a fleur de lys in the vase and one above it. (Some of the First Folio crown watermarks incorporate a small fleur-de-lys.) Finally, the portrait's watermark appears near the centre of the bottom third of the page—at the level of Shakespeare's chest—rather than in the centre. τA2-6 Repairs to the corners without loss.

Text: 323 x c. 207 mm. In very good condition. Numbers of lines on many pages are lightly underlined in pencil; there are scarcely any marginalia. A number of small tears and a few small holes expertly repaired. x6 has a repaired tear nearly across the page (words/lines distorted). vv4-6 have burn holes (repaired so expertly that the joining of the text is all but invisible); the burn has a small, diminishing effect on subsequent leaves to x4. ee5 and 3b4 also have larger than usual repairs. 3b5-6: in facsimile. [vi]. [vii]—see Binding, below.

PROVENANCE: Data: Bookplate pasted to [iV]: The Library/Hagley Hall'. [iiV]-[ivV] blank. [ivV] A MS note: 'Similar copy (?) with portrait by Droeshout offered for sale by Quaritch for £250. 1850'. [vV] An oval stamp: 'Hagley Hall' and MS: '12 5/8 x 8 1/4'. This leaf has a watermark '1A'. τA2[2] MS signatures (slightly trimmed) at top margin: 'Tho: & Isabella', followed in a different hand by: 'J Harvey'. The latter signature is repeated at top of τA3 (trimmed), and four more times between there and Al--'incidentally confirming the integrity of the preliminaries'.

Owners: (1) Apparently the property c 1660 of Sir Thomas Hervey, Knt., M. P. for Bury St. Edmonds, and his wife Isabella. [2] Owned subsequently by their son John Hervey [1665-1751], first Earl of Bristol, . . . and [3] by that Earl's son, John Hervey of Ickworth. [4] Acquired c 1810 by William Henry, third Baron Lyttelton, grandfather of> (5) the ninth Viscount Cobham, John Cavendish Lyttelton, who owned it in 1902. (6) The volume was deposited temporarily at the Birmingham Reference Library. It was 'offered via Hesketh and Wood Nov 87 w/3 other folios, £950,000, via Q[uaritch]' (Note in Quaritch's Lee, Census). It was still owned by the eleventh Viscount in 1990, when it was offered for sale with the copies of the Second, Third and Fourth Folios—for $1 million. (7) All four sold June 1990 to Meisei University (for $900,000, according to an oral report).

Reference: Quaritch Catalogue 1120 (1990), item 94.
**GENERAL AND SPECIAL COMMENTS:** William Congreve's copy, with some notations in his hand (see Provenance: Data, below). A continuous provenance from the late seventeenth century. Five preliminaries in facsimile. Lacks all of *Troilus & Cressida* and most of *Cymbeline*. 'Probably a copy of the first issue'.


**Text:** 330 x c. 210 mm. Remarkably clean, with few underlinings and marginalia (except in *Love's Labour's Lost*). Many small tears, all neatly repaired, which go through but do not obscure the text. Some catchwords partly lost. A1-A16 A horseshoe shaped tear, about 30 or 40 mm, on right side of column a (recto) extends--diminishing--all the way from A1 to I6; all tears mended, sometimes with minor obscuring of the text. K6^v Bottom corner mended, bottom line partly lost. M3^p-v Small hole, affecting ll. 1989 and 2116. N1 Repaired tear, which passes through the text at ll. 23-27 and 78-87. P2 Bottom fore-corner rejoined (the tear passing through ll. 1100-09 and 1162-73. Q5^v Marginal notes in Congreve's hand--'the Spanish Friar' and 'Anthony in all for Love'. Top corner of this leaf had a fold when printed, so that the top two lines of Q5^v are obscured. Q6 Repaired tear passing through ll. 764-88 and 947-60, as well as the catchwords. T3^v Corner tear partly obscures four bottom lines of text. Y5 Repaired tear with some loss of text. Aa1^F Some words of ll. 62-64 have offset on the blank page opposite.

- e4 Bottom fore-corner rejoined with tear passing through ll. 1231-40 and 1295-1302. g2 Bottom corner repair just touches bottom line. h6 Repaired tear passing through ll. 1325-26 and 1521-22. i1 Repaired tear passing through ll. 1568-72 and 1763-66. l3 Repaired tear passing through ll. 287-88. l5 Repaired tear passing through ll. 454, 517-19 and 521. t3 Repaired tear passing through ll. 45-53 and 198-209. t4 Repaired tear touching ll. 461-63. x3 Small hole in text. 'gg3'-3j1 Lacking (fifteen leaves). zz6 Repaired tear passing through ll. 775-77 and removing 'the' at the end of l. 962. 3a1-3b5 Lacking (eleven leaves). 3b6 in facsimile. [ix]-[xii] Modern paper. [xiii]-[xiv] Vellum.

---

100 Ibid.
101 Blayney, 34. Blayney discusses the three issues of the First Folio on p 24.
PROVENANCE: Data: [vii^v] Label: 'Case K Shelf 1'. Signature (ink): 'Charles Killigrew'. Label (printed): early nineteenth-century bookplate of Leeds coat of arms. [viii^v] (pencil): 'Shakespeare'. \( ^\text{R} \text{A5+2} \) Top (ink): 'Edw Bath his book'. Foot, signature (ink): Charles Killigrew. \( ^\text{R} \text{A6Γ} \) Top, signature (ink): 'Will: Congreve' (See also Q5^v in Collation). Reference (2) comments on the MS: 'It has a few annotations in [Congreve's] hand, notably in As You Like It, in which he adds references, in the margin of the First Lord's speeches about the melancholy Jacques, to Dryden's The Spanish Fryar and to Antony in his All for Love.'

Owners: (1) Edward Bath (Untraced). (2) Charles Killigrew (1655-1725), Master of the Revels and patentee of Drury Lane Theatre from 1682. (3) William Congreve (1670-1729), dramatist. 'As a successful playwright he was obviously closely acquainted with his contemporary Killigrew, the manager of London's most successful theatre.'102 (4 and 5) Henrietta, second Duchess of Marlborough, d 1733: Congreve 'had a liaison with Henrietta, . . . the wife of Francis Godolphin [d 1766]. . . . [A daughter, Mary, born in 1723,] was unquestionably Congreve's, though Godolphin never disowned her. Henrietta inherited Congreve's estate, including his library, and passed it on to Mary, who in 1740 married Thomas Osbourne, fourth Duke of Leeds'. (6) 'The book passed by direct descent'. Lee, Census, records the owner as The Duke of Leeds, Hornby Castle, Yorkshire. (7) Prior to its sale in 1990, the volume was deposited in the Brotherton Collection, Leeds University Library. (8) Offered for sale ('by order of the 10th Duke of Leeds will trust') at Christie's, London, with an estimate of £100,000-150,000. Christie's 'believe this to be the only extant Shakespeare Folio, known to have belonged to a seventeenth century English dramatist'. (9) Bought by Quaritch on behalf of Meisei at Christie's, 28 November 1990, for £95,000.103 Application for an export licence was challenged 'on behalf of the nation', but the challenge was unsuccessful. The volume was in the University Library in August 1991.


102 Christie's Catalogue (Reference 3). All quotations in this section are from this source.
103 This was the first occasion that the saleroom in the newly completed extension of Christie's was used. Coincidentally, Meisei 2 had the same honour a century before, when it was sold 'at Christie's new gallery' in 1888 (cf Meisei 2, Provenance [iii^v]).
GENERAL AND SPECIAL COMMENTS: 'It has 26 leaves in facsimile, including the Title-page with portrait and the leaf “To the Reader.” The leaf of Ben Jonson’s verses is slightly defective, and some margins are neatly repaired. The facsimile leaves have been beautifully executed on old paper, even to the reproduction of the slight dust soiling as always occurs in books of this age' (Reference 3). Its size in Lee, Census, translated into millimetres, is 305 x 200 mm.


PROVENANCE: Owners: (1) The owner in Lee, Census, is <Alexander Peckover, Esq., LL.D., F.S.A., Bank House, Wisbech>, who acquired it in <1897>. (2) Sold at Sotheby’s, Lot 632, 5 November 1951 (Sotheby’s Cat). ‘The more important works sold yesterday [at the Sotheby’s book sale] came from the well known collection of the late Lord Peckover of Wisbech. Among them was . . . [a First Folio], 26 leaves in facsimile, which made £780 ([purchased by] R C Pearson)’ (Reference (2)). (3) ‘(2611) Sold by Pearson of Cambridge, Nov 1952’ (Note in Quaritch’s copy of Lee, Census). There is no indication to whom it was sold. (4) Sold at Christie’s, New York, 5 December 1991, for $90,000. (5) Acquired by Meisei.

References: (1) Sotheby’s Cat, 5 November 1951. (2) Undated newspaper clipping (6 November 1951?) in the files of Mr Patrick Pearson, son of R C Pearson who published Reference 3. (3) Catalogue 12, nd (1952?), of R C Pearson, bookseller, 32 Hobson Street, Cambridge. The catalogue entry indicates that the volume was already sold. (4) Christie’s Cat, December 1991, lot 324.

BINDING: ‘Finely bound in crushed, crimson levant morocco, rough gilt edges, by Tout’ (Reference 3).

PRIVATE COPY, TOKYO

GENERAL AND SPECIAL COMMENTS: The first First Folio in Japan. Preliminaries are in facsimile; forty-seven other leaves are from the Second and Third

---

104 Conversation in August 1991 with Mr Mitsuo Nitta.
Folios. (All quotations in the description of this copy are from the Catalogue cited in Reference, below.)

**COLLATION:** Preliminaries: 'All 9 preliminaries . . . are in lithographic facsimile'. Text: 'A pink stain caused by damp in the upper outer corner of most leaves, margins of several leaves repaired slightly affecting the text in a few cases, 1 or 2 small holes in a few leaves'. Supplied from Second Folio: 'C5-6, D1, H4, I1-2, and 4-6, K3, L2-5, R2 and 5-6, V6, Y5, Z5, xgg 4-5, h2, i2-4 (30 Leaves)'. Supplied from Third Folio: 'A2-3 and 5-6, B1-2, zz 3-6, aaa1-6, bbb1 (17 leaves)'. 'The last 5 leaves in lithographic facsimile'.

**PROVENANCE:** Owners: (1) Offered for sale in 1969 for £6,400 (See Reference below). (2) Purchased by Mr Kamijo, who died c. 1981, leaving the volume to (3) (?) his son. By a provision of his will, access to the volume was proscribed for thirteen years from the date of his death.\(^{105}\)

**Reference:** Item number 277 in Catalogue of British Antiquarian Book Fair, Tokyo, 23 September-5 October 1969. The Catalogue was a joint venture between H M Fletcher & Co, London, and Yushodo Booksellers Ltd, Tokyo.

**BINDING:** 'Red-morocco gilt, panelled sides and spine, g. edge, by Riviere, joints cracked and crudely mended'.

---

\(^{105}\) Information supplied by Mr Mutsuo Nitta.
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PART III: CENSUS

Part III covers searching for and identifying First Folios; defines what to count as a copy, and examines and embraces three unacknowledged copies at the Folger; shows the number and distribution of copies at the beginning and end of this century; and presents the new world-wide census of copies.
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INTRODUCTION

This chapter outlines the attempts in the nineteenth century to record copies of the First Folio, describes Sidney Lee’s considerable achievement in census-making and summarises the subsequent attempts to update the census. It then tells the story of the search for the present census. Finally, it examines the details of doubtful identifications and records relevant data for furthering the work of identification.

A THE SEARCHES OF SIDNEY LEE AND OTHERS

Before Sidney Lee there were a number of endeavours to list known copies of the First Folio. The first was by Thomas Frognall Dibdin in *The Library Companion* in 1824. Having said he was ‘about to make mention of thirty copies’, he in fact mentioned forty-five. He listed three in his first class, eight in his second and fifteen in his third. In addition he mentioned seventeen others by owner and two more in catalogues. For most of these volumes he gave brief descriptions and in some cases a succession of owners.\(^1\) In 1825, in the second edition of his *Companion*, he gave a similar listing, with a fourth copy in his first class.\(^2\) In 1834, William Thomas Lowndes in his *Bibliographer’s Manual* listed the owners, sales, dates and prices of sixteen copies.\(^3\) According to *The Athenæum* in 1864 ‘the late [Thomas Rodd, the bookseller] made a list of about a hundred copies of the work that had passed under his own notice; and the lowest estimate would give at least two hundred copies in this country, exclusive of the no small number that have been transported to America’.\(^4\) His estimate was remarkably prescient. Lee in his *Census* Introduction says Rodd died without completing his list and asserts that ‘no trace of it survives’ (12). In 1864 Henry G Bohn, in his revised edition of Lowndes’s *Manual* listed and briefly described thirty-four copies which sold between 1787 and 1860, sometimes mentioning the buyer, and he added five more listed by owner.\(^5\) In 1870, in America, S Austin Allibone, in *A Critical Dictionary of English Literature*, repeated Bohn’s listing and additionally mentioned a few offers with prices.\(^6\) Disappointingly he did not list American owners. This was rectified in 1874 by Justin Winsor, who listed seventeen American owners.\(^7\) In 1876 he listed nineteen (Winsor, 87-90), but one of the additional volumes turned out to be a facsimile. In

---

\(^2\) T F Dibdin, *The Library Companion*, 2nd edn (1825), 817-24. The four he placed in his first class are Lee 1, 3, 5 and 45--ie, Lee assigned three of them to his Class I A, but the fourth to Class IIA.
\(^3\) The *Bibliographer’s Manual* (1834), v, 1644.
\(^4\) The Editor, ‘Our Weekly Gossip’, *Athenæum*, no. 1915 (July, 1864), 54.
\(^5\) Bibliographer’s *Manual*, IV, 2253-54.
\(^7\) ‘The First Folio of Shakespeare, 1623’, no. 46 (1 April 1874), in ‘[Account of all known copies of early quarto and folio editions of Shakespeare. Boston, 1874-77]’ (Binder’s title.) A series of leaves torn from his Boston Public Library Reports . . .’ (Folger Library card catalogue).
1888 William H Fleming listed thirteen copies in New York City alone, most of which
he described in detail (Fleming, 103-17).

In July 1897 Holcombe Ingleby wrote to N&Q, expressing concern that the DNB
had recently written that only forty copies ‘seem now known’, and offered to prepare a
list and send it to N&Q for publication if readers would inform him of the whereabouts
of copies. In September, regretting ‘only four of your correspondents have availed
themselves of the invitation’, he published a list of forty-five by owner, adding ‘there
are doubtless many owners of copies not included.’ In October, a certain RR sent
from Boston, Lincolnshire, a list of thirty-two copies which he believed ‘includes none
mentioned by Mr. Ingleby’. The first twenty-three in his list were from retail sales
catalogues with prices, the next six from auctions with sellers and prices, and he added
two more. In November, Ingleby wrote again, extending his list to fifty-four.
Ingleby’s list is followed by notes from three correspondents mentioning three more
copies. Adding this fifty-four and three to RR’s thirty-two, we have eighty-nine
recorded copies in 1897, excluding some of those mentioned by Winsor and Fleming.
As for estimates of the number of extant copies, Halliwell-Phillipps wrote to Justin
Winsor c. 1876 that he thought there were 300-400 copies in Great Britain (Winsor,
79); RR in the letter just mentioned said the number ‘may be estimated at nearly 200’;
and Lee himself in 1898 says that ‘about 140 copies have been traced within the past
century’ (1898, 311).

From the middle of the nineteenth century there had been calls for a complete listing
of copies. In 1852, a certain Bonsall asked in N&Q: ‘Would it not be interesting to the
lovers of Shakespeare if there was a record . . . of the “whereabouts” of the first folios,
with their dimensions and condition?’ There was a similar appeal the following year
by a correspondent who signed him- or herself ‘C’. In 1877 John Payne Collier
enquired after the whereabouts of two copies he had seen in Lilly’s bookshop. A
certain Jabez responded that he had probably seen at Lilly’s one of the copies
mentioned by Collier and mentions another First and a Second Folio owned by S W
Singer: ‘I ask, what has become of them?’ The same year, another note demanded:
‘Surely all the world ought to know how many copies of the First Folio are in
existence, and where, from time to time, they are’.

8 ‘The First Folio of Shakespeare’, N&Q, 8th ser, 12 (1897), 63. The same title in N&Q heads the
article in each citation in the next four footnotes.
9 Ibid, 222.
10 Ibid, 282. Presumably RR is Robert Roberts of Boston, Lincolnshire, referred to by Lee in
Facsimile, xxxv.
11 Ibid, 413.
12 Ibid, 282.
13 ‘Shakespeare Folios’, N&Q, 1st ser, 6 (1852), 195.
14 ‘First Folio Shakespeare’, N&Q, 1st ser, 7 (1853), 129-30.
16 Jabez, (no initials), ‘Copies of the Shakespeare Folios of 1623 and 1632’, N&Q, 5th ser, 7 (1877),
455.
17 A J M, ‘Copies of the Shakespeare Folios of 1623 and 1632’, N&Q, 5th ser, 8 (1877), 78.
As Lee himself claims, his was the ‘first systematic endeavour to ascertain the number and whereabouts’ of all copies. At the start of the present century, when he was asked by Oxford University Press to edit the facsimile edition of the Folio, he ‘hit upon the resolve to track down and describe all surviving copies. For three years I pursued the quest, and at the end of 1902 there was published, by way of appendix to the Oxford facsimile of the First Folio, a folio pamphlet of some forty-eight pages which I entitled A Census of Extant Copies with some Account of their History and Condition. Files from Lee’s search are preserved in the Records Office of the Shakespeare Centre in Stratford.

At the end of the Introduction to his Census, Lee describes how he carried out his search:

The plan that was adopted at the outset was to forward to persons who, there was reason to believe, might own or have access to a copy of the First Folio, a printed schedule of inquiries [particulars], with a request that it should be filled up and returned to me.

Preserved at the Folger Library is an example of his ‘Schedule of Particulars’ together with his covering letter, personally addressed to ‘Mr H. C. Folger, Standard Oil Company, New York’. These are reproduced as Appendix S 1 to show what information Lee sought. He was fortunate in the ‘response rate’ to his mailing: ‘In only a trifling number of instances did my application fail to elicit the required response, and the correspondence that ensued has been consequently large’ (17) – as the Stratford archive demonstrates. He was equally fortunate in receiving unsolicited information: ‘Very often information was sent to me spontaneously without any direct application on my part’ (17). He researched among ‘old sale-catalogues’; he consulted the DNB (of which he was the editor); and he went through the first fifteen volumes of BPC (1887-1901) and the first seven volumes of ABPC (1895–1901). He solicited information from readers of the London Athenæum in March 1901, indicating the audience for whom he intended his work: ‘Such a census of copies, if satisfactorily

---

19 Lee, 1924, 78-79.
20 The ‘First Folio Census’ archive is one of ten categories in the Sir Sidney Lee Collection at the Stratford Records Office. It consists itself of ten sub-categories of documents, stored in three boxes, with reference numbers ER 85/6/1 (i and ii) and ER 85/6/2-10. The documents in the first sub-category, dated 1901-1902, in two boxes, are bundles of notes, correspondence and census returns, including a large body of letters from M. E. Blatchford, referred to below (she helped Lee greatly with the American part of his search). Sub-categories 2-10, in the third box, consist of printed copies of Lee’s publications, some annotated, and such other documents as press cuttings concerning the Census and correspondence 1906-16 with Folio owners. ER 85/6/6 is a very heavily corrected typescript of Lee’s 1923 lecture, prepared for Lee, 1924.
21 Census Introduction, 17. Unfootnoted quotations in this and the following paragraph are from the same source, 16-19.
22 In Folder #1 (of thirteen manila folders) at the back of a drawer marked ‘Correspondence Folios & Quartos’ in a dark green file cabinet in closet #2, Cataloguing Office, at the Folger Shakespeare Library (September 1992).
executed, would be of permanent value to bibliographers, collectors, and students', making a final appeal for information on copies in the same journal in June 1902. He acknowledged the help of many others—'owners, Shakespearean scholars, and booksellers in the United Kingdom and the United States' —in locating copies, describing copies and researching provenances. He particularly cites 'Two citizens of the United States' for the American part of his search: 'Miss M. E. Blatchford, of Cambridge [Massachusetts], herself the owner of a valuable First Folio, and Mr. W. H. Fleming, of New York, the Shakespearean critic, have devoted themselves to the work with great enthusiasm, and without their co-operation my results, as far as the United States are concerned, must have been far less perfect than they are'.

Among the documents in the Lee archive in the Records Office in Stratford is Lee's heavily annotated working list of copies, dated (from internal evidence) about April 1902. It consists of six folio pages of manuscript, including a one-page index. It has 186 numbered copies, presumably arranged in the chronological order in which he received the first information on a copy, with many copies crossed out or with some such note as 'No, only 2nd or 3rd'. He must have worked very hard indeed in the following months to complete the census and classify the copies in time for the volume to be set, proofed, printed and published before the end of the year.

For classifying copies, Lee depended 'for the most part on information supplied by the owners' (19). This was risky, since most of them, even librarians, must have been amateurs when it came to bibliographical description. Of the 158 extant copies he recorded in the Census, he says he 'personally examined' only forty-three, and admits 'I have collated comparatively few of these without the assistance of the present owners and guardians' (19). It is clear that we must regard the accuracy and consistency of the descriptions with caution, especially since Lee does not indicate which copies (other than a few he refers to specifically) he personally examined and since he does not cite the source or authority of the information he received from others.

Lee gives plenty of evidence in his Introduction to the Census of the pains to which he went to identify copies, to eliminate duplicate entries and to trace the pedigree (as he calls the provenance) of copies. His persistence can be illustrated with documents in the Folger files—in the same Folder #1 referred to above. There are three original,

23 Sidney Lee, Letter, Athenæum, no. 3829 (March, 1901), 347.
24 Sidney Lee, Letter, Athenæum, no. 3893 (June, 1902), 722. Lee's appeal for information prompted a highly critical reaction from Appleton Morgan, President of the New York Shakespeare Society, in 'Sidney Lee and First Folio Shakespeare' (The [New York] Sun, 21 April 1902, (no page reference)). In an article in New Shakespeareana, the editor quotes this letter and Lee's reply defending himself. The editor then spends several pages criticising Lee, for example for not acknowledging his sources and for not properly recognising American Shakespeare scholarship, and expressing concern about his 'equipment and competency' to do the census, based on the inadequacies found in his Life—'The Cataloguing of First Folios from an American Point of View,' New Shakespeareana, 1, no. 1 (New York, 1901), 18-22 (19).
25 'First Folio Schedules Received', referenceER85/6/1. I was able to cull additional information from the returns for some of the missing copies.
26 See for example pp 13-14 and the note on p 15.
blank—that is to say, unreturned—copies of Lee’s questionnaire in the folder. Presumably he sent the first of these in February 1901, the date printed on the covering letter. Then there is a letter in Lee’s handwriting from his home address, dated 6 April 1901, which simply says (in total): ‘Dear Sir: I venture to ask your assistance in the research I am engaged on in regard to the present whereabouts of original copies of the Shakespeare First Folio. Yours very truly, Sidney Lee’. Presumably this was a covering note for a second copy of the questionnaire. Having not heard from Folger, on 9 May 1902 Lee sent him another hand-written note, perhaps enclosing the third copy of the questionnaire. This note explicitly conveys a sense of urgency with ‘my copy] has to go to press very soon’ and with a ‘PS’ added, saying ‘I am particularly anxious to trace the history of the ownership of this copy’. Still receiving no answer, he marshalled the help of others to convey his anxiety. On 17 July 1902, Philip M Wheeler of Brooklyn wrote to Folger: ‘He has heard of the copy you possess, and is anxious to ascertain the particulars of its condition’. On 25 August 1902, George A Plimpton, of Ginn & Co. Publishers, wrote: ‘While I was in London Sidney Lee was very anxious to get information in regard to your first edition Shakespeare...’ He says he has written you several times, but has received no reply’. The blank questionnaires in the folder are silent witnesses of Folger’s non-co-operation—motivated presumably by his desire to keep his purchases quiet. It is noteworthy that Lee, Wheeler and Plimpton all refer to Folger’s Folio holding in the singular. At the time Folger already possessed six copies and had been in hot pursuit of the Vincent copy (Folger 1), which he had learned about from an article by Lee, for over three years.

Lee’s diligence, persistence and attention to detail produced a work of enduring value. As noted in Chapter 1, Pollard called it ‘his valuable and interesting Census’ (1909, 137). Its reception, however, was somewhat mixed. Greg’s reaction was very negative, as evidenced by the question marks, exclamation marks and marginal comments in his personal copy of the Census Introduction (‘quite unknown’, regarding the edition size of the later Folios (7); and ‘untrue !?’, regarding the price of the later Folios (8)). In his 1903 critique of the Facsimile edition and the Census in The Library, he sums up his view of Lee’s scholarship: ‘Throughout, indeed, Mr. Lee appears to say rather more and to put it in a rather more dogmatic manner than the facts warrant’.28 After grudgingly granting that ‘The Census itself is no doubt an interesting compilation’, he roundly criticises the classification system; for example, he concludes (with respect to the relegation of Lee 20 to Class IB while Lee 4 is allowed to stand in [Class IA]): ‘Either the classification is wrong or the description is inadequate’.29 The review in the New York Times, ‘Sidney Lee: American Collectors Object to his First

---

27 W W Greg, MS notes [nd] in his copy of Lee, Census, in the Morris Library of Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, USA.
29 Ibid, 267. For Lee’s classes and further comments on them by Greg, see the beginning of Section A in Chapter 6.
Folio Census', is highly critical. It documents in detail, citing an array of copies, the inadequacies of the classification system, and castigates the fact that he saw so few copies: "The fact Mr. Lee has personally seen only a few of the copies he describes makes his "Census" merely a literary list, and not an authoritative contribution to bibliography' as Lee had claimed in the last sentence of the Census Introduction. In another passage, objecting to his not having identified 'two supplied leaves', it laments caustically: '(and this is bibliography!)'.\(^{30}\) Similarly, a New York Catalogue in 1903, while commending Lee’s efforts to locate and describe every copy, wished that his visit to America in that year had been a 'Bibliographical, as well as a lecturing tour, and had taken place before the issue of the 'Census', instead of after'.\(^{31}\) These criticisms of the Census are well founded. Its principal weaknesses are its inaccuracies, its classification system and its failure to give sources. Schoenbaum sums up precisely the reliability of Lee’s scholarship with the words: 'the muddle-headedness, the imprecisions, the unwarranted assumptions and certainties' (1970, 525). Although one must always be cautious and sceptical concerning his accuracy, the fact is he made a detailed record of Folio copies before many of them changed hands and became geographically dispersed. Although he fell short of his own expectations in recording the provenance of copies (Lee, 1924, 86), he nevertheless gathered details of the history of most volumes which would not have been available today. He was rightly proud of having significantly increased the number of recorded Folios—by his own account by 108 copies.\(^{32}\) To the present day his Census has been an invaluable tool for untold numbers of scholars and bibliophiles. Copies are universally referred to by their Lee numbers or are noted as 'not in Lee'. Further, without the Census as a point of departure, the difficulties of any later census-maker would have been multiplied a thousand times.

Within a month of the publication of the Census Lee began to learn of copies he had not included. In The Library of April 1906, he recorded fourteen additional copies, made some corrections and updatings to the Census and ended by correctly predicting that, with the tide 'running so strongly towards the West', the ratio in the distribution of Folios between the UK and the USA would soon be reversed.\(^{33}\) Even including Lee’s 'Additions', the Census was far from complete. People in the know were aware of this. In a letter in 1918, Bernard Quaritch, referring to the fact that Lee knew of only 140 copies, wrote, with notable accuracy, that 'there must be at least 60 to 80 more in existence'.\(^{34}\) By the time of Lee’s First Folio Tercentenary lecture in 1923, he had

---


\(^{31}\) Ernest Dressel North, Catalogue no. 2 (New York City, April 1903), 3.

\(^{32}\) Lee, 1906, 4. The precise number of copies first recorded by Lee is difficult to determine, as noted in Chapter 6, Section A.

\(^{33}\) Lee, 1906, 30.

\(^{34}\) Letter, 18 November 1918, to Howard Pease, Esq, filed among documents associated with Meisei 2 (West 201) in the Kodama Memorial Library, Meisei University.
discovered fourteen of them (or fifteen if the Roorkee volume is an original). The total number of copies recorded by Lee is covered in Chapter 6, Section B.

Between Lee and the present day two significant starts were made to update his Census. The first was by Seymour De Ricci. It is evident he was watching out for copies: in 1921, he reckoned about 180 copies have been traced in 1926, he noted that since 1906 some fifteen or twenty more [copies] have come to light. In the Folger Shakespeare Library, as mentioned in Chapter 1, there is a box containing over 200 5 x 8 inch typed slips, identified by an introductory slip in manuscript: 'Copy of S. de Ricci's Note book - First Folios. This was made before his 1932 visit to the [Folger Shakespeare Library] when he saw the folios...'. The slips are divided into four sections: copies from Lee, Census, copies from Lee, 1906, copies numbered by De Ricci and other data. From the last number in the third section it is evident that by 1932 De Ricci had recorded 193 copies. I have accounted for all these copies in the new Census. (The fourth section, containing sixteen slips, six of them in manuscript, consists mostly of notes of Folio sales in the nineteenth century.) De Ricci never published the results of his search.

The other start on an updated census was made by Robert Metcalf Smith (1886-1952), Professor at Lehigh University, Pennsylvania. He wrote a letter to the Daily Telegraph in 1935 in which he says in part that he has just completed an examination of the Folios at the Folger 'in preparation for a new census of extant copies for which I have been gathering data since the decease of Sir Sidney Lee in 1925'. Like De Ricci, Smith never published the results of his search. In 1927 in his 'The Shakespeare Folios... With a List of Original Folios in American Libraries', he presented what he had learned so far. He noted that Lee was unaware of the Lehigh copy, which had been acquired as early as 1887; he commented that 'Lee's prediction that the proportion of privately owned British to American copies would in the next generation be reversed has already come true'; and he concluded that the American total 'is probably now well beyond the hundred mark; and most of these folios are now in the libraries of private collectors' (12-13). He thought Folger had over fifty copies (13). In fact by 1926 Folger already had seventy-three. Unfortunately, the list he presents is limited to college, university, public and foundation libraries. It contains twenty-five copies in

---

36 A Noble Fragment: Being a Leaf of the Original First Folio... With a Bibliographical Essay by Seymour de Ricci (New York, 1926), 4.
37 I do not know the whereabouts of the original notebook from which this copy was made, or whether it is extant.
38 Daily Telegraph, 7 March 1935, 143.
39 I corresponded with Lehigh University in an attempt to trace his papers, but was unsuccessful.
sixteen institutions;¹¹ two of which were not recorded by Lee—Lehigh University and the Grosvenor Library, Buffalo (16-17).

More recently there were two more listings. In 1950 there was a Checklist of American Copies of STC Books. It listed twenty institutions holding a First Folio, but does not give the number of copies.¹² Finally, there is Harold Otness's Folio Handbook and Census (1990). For census purposes this work focuses on American institutional copies. It does not include privately held copies. I should like to pay tribute to this American listing: it supersedes Winsor and Fleming; only Otness could know the time his work saved me. It embraces all four seventeenth-century Folios and gives details of provenance and binding for most copies, other than those in the Folger-taking up thirty-eight pages. For the Folger copies it gives only totals and a summary comment. It lists 134 First Folios in forty American institutions. In contrast, his short chapter (nine pages) entitled 'Lee's Census Updated' aims to be no more than 'a listing-in-progress' (123). Unfortunately, it is replete with errors and inaccuracies, as well as inconsistencies with his American listing. The reader will be better served to consult the latter.

B THE SEARCH FOR THE NEW CENSUS

The section has several purposes. First, to describe the extent of the search for the new Census and thus enable the reader to assess the likelihood of any First Folios escaping its grasp. Second, to document the trails followed and the tools and methods used, and thus help anyone inclined to continue the search to benefit from my experience and to decide where to focus effort. Third, to express the intrinsic pleasure that accompanies the activity of seeking, and occasionally finding, treasure trove—particularly when clues, detective-work and some sleuthing are involved.

My search for the new Census began in January 1990 with the completion of a search plan and the assembly of readily available data from Lee, Census; Lee, 1906; Lee, 1924; Lee, 1931; STC;¹³ the catalogues of the Folger Shakespeare and the New York Public Libraries and David Ramage's A Finding-List of English Books to 1640,¹⁴ The main effort was completed with the submission of galley proofs for my 'Provisional Census' article to The Library in November 1994—about five years. This compares to Lee's three years and Otness's decade, mentioned in his preface (ix). I say the 'main effort' because the search continues. In fact, it will never end while there are

¹¹ Columbia, Lehigh, Brown, Yale, Harvard, Williams, UCLA, Texas, Boston Public Library, California State Library (Sutro Branch, two copies), Library of Congress, Grosvenor Library (Buffalo), Huntington (four), Pierpont Morgan (three), Newberry, and New York Public Library (four).
¹³ STC 11 (1976) lists five institutions in the UK and five in the USA holding First Folios, noting with a + sign that more copies exist than those in the libraries cited.
recorded copies whose location is unknown and while there remains the remotest possibility of finding an unrecorded copy.

**Searching for Unrecorded Copies**

In looking for unrecorded copies I cast a wide net in the UK and Ireland. Using Moelwyn Williams's *A Directory of Rare Book and Special Collections*, which has a daunting 600 pages, I selected 449 libraries. These included public libraries, county libraries, record offices, livery companies, cathedrals, public schools, universities and even 'unlikely' libraries if they had been founded by 1623. Apart from libraries known to have a First Folio, they excluded only special collections, such as scientific and hospital, having nothing to do with literature or drama. To each I sent a brief questionnaire, asking if they had a copy, or knew of any Lee copy which had moved since 1902 or of any non-Lee copy. An example of this questionnaire appears in Appendix S 2. I received 221 replies. None produced an unrecorded copy, but I received much useful information including, for example, confirmation that Winchester College has a copy not mentioned in Lee. About the same time I sent an ‘Information Please’ notice, requesting the same information, to eight journals—such as *N&Q*, *SQ*, and *The Book Collector*. The last responded by suggesting a more detailed request for information (see later). I am not aware of receiving by this avenue any information which I would not have discovered anyway—certainly no unrecorded copies.

I did not make a general mailing in the USA, since Harold Otness had just covered the ground preparing his *Folio Handbook* which came out in 1990. In the rest of the world I wrote initially to thirty-six individuals or institutions in Austria, Canada, China, France, Germany, Holland, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, Poland, Russia and Sweden. Eventually, with follow-up, I received a reply from most of them, but no information on unrecorded copies. In addition, I wrote to or visited such booksellers as Quaritch and Sotheran in the UK; Ximenes, Goodspeed, Kraus and Heritage in the USA; Woelfle in Germany and Yushodo in Japan. I invariably enquired specifically after both institutional and privately held copies, and asked for the names of likely institutions and persons to whom I should also write. These visits and letters produced the names of many other persons to pursue, such as possible owners, but the net result of the search was the discovery of no unrecorded copies.

Clearly, one obstacle to wrinkling out information on privately held copies was the twin issue of privacy and security. To reassure private owners, and to encourage booksellers and others to reveal the existence of a privately-held copy, I developed at the start a one-page statement on the ‘Security and Privacy Requirements of Owners’. This is reproduced in Appendix S 3. It was intended to satisfy whatever privacy or

---

45 Moelwyn I Williams, ed, *A Directory of Rare Book and Special Collections in the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland* (1985). I also consulted the second edition of this work when it came out, ed B C Bloomfield (1997).

security requirements an owner might have. He or she could choose among graduated options for recording the copy in the new census and, at the extreme, include neither their name nor the location of the volume. I enclosed this statement in every letter I sent (in all phases of the search). I have no documented evidence that the statement helped. However, three private owners, having read or heard of my search, wrote unsolicited letters to me about their copy, and no private owner whom I approached either directly, or indirectly through Sotheby's, Christie's or a book-dealer, failed to respond with the information I needed.\(^\text{47}\) Several private owners took advantage of the options (for example, to have their name and address withheld). As it happened, none of the privately-owned copies was previously unrecorded. One possible exception is the Kamijo copy in Tokyo, which I was unable to see and which I have not identified.

Finally, as a research tool for this search and other purposes, I developed a record of First Folio sales in this century, which gives available information on each copy, such as Lee number (if any and if known), previous owners, seller, auctioneer, buyer, price, and identifying details. This is Table W in Chapter 1. Conceivably among the unidentified copies in this table are one or more not previously recorded (see next subsection, item 9).

### Confirming and Identifying Recorded Copies

The points of departure for confirming recorded copies were Lee, \textit{Census}, 1906, 1924 and 1931, as well as the other works mentioned above in the second paragraph of this Section. The starting-point was twenty-four UK public institutions in Lee, \textit{Census}, having at least one copy and fifty-three UK private owners in Lee, \textit{Census} for whose copy I had as yet no record of change of ownership. For owners that were known, the principal methods of confirmation were visiting and/or writing to the owner. I have personally inspected fifty-six copies in institutional libraries in the UK, Ireland, the USA, Italy and Japan. I also inspected three copies (two of them among the fifty-six just mentioned) as they passed through Christie's or Quaritch; the open and generous access to these copies was perhaps the modern equivalent of Lee's being lent a fine copy during most of the time he was census-making. For institutions I could not visit, and with whom I was not already in correspondence, I made three mailings: to institutions in the UK, the USA and the rest of the world.\(^\text{48}\) Otness's \textit{Handbook} was a very valuable starting-point for institutional copies in the USA. If obtaining the

\(^{47}\) Owen Gingerich suggests another reason for cooperation in America: 'Fortunately for the census taker, American collectors are not particularly secretive, an attribute probably closely tied with the comparative honesty of our income tax structure' (\textit{The Great Copernicus Chase and Other Adventures in Astronomical History} (Cambridge, MA, 1992), 76.

\(^{48}\) In these mailings, I was tempted to include a questionnaire to elicit detailed information on each copy. I tested this approach with two American universities. A copy of the questionnaire appears in Appendix A. One did not reply; the other said it would try and didn't. Accordingly, I focused on the objective of getting confirmation of ownership and location, the prerequisite to being able to go back later to seek copy details. The questionnaire will now be used, at least as a checklist, in the second phase of this project--to describe all First Folios.
addresses of American institutions was easy, getting a response from them often was not. Of the thirty-six in my mailing, seven needed a follow-up letter; when the librarians of five of these still did not respond, a letter to the President of their university was required to produce the needed evidence.

For owners, new or discovered since Lee, including private owners, I gradually assembled information from inspecting catalogues, perusing accounts of book sales, and writing to likely sources such as academic specialists and rare-book dealers. Visiting and talking with book specialists, in particular at Quaritch, Sotheby's, Christie's and the Folger Library was especially fruitful. Much useful information came from inspecting nine copies of the Lee Census that had been annotated. These were two working copies in the book trade, one belonging to an auction house, the other to a key rare-book dealer; Sidney Lee's copy at the Records Office of the Shakespeare Centre in Stratford; Henry Folger's, A C R Carter's and three other copies at the Folger Library; and W W Greg's copy.

As tools for keeping track of correspondence and copies during the search I used two control lists. The first was a simple letter log, including a column with either an 'X' (not replied) or a 'V' (replied). At each periodic update of the log the 'Xs' received attention. Such a log was essential, as I sent over 300 letters (in addition to the mailings) during the five years of the search. By the time the Provisional Census went to press, for all the Folios I had not seen myself, I had received a document from the owner or keeper confirming ownership and address (again, the Kamijo copy is an exception). The second control tool was a two-part list of copies. One part was organised according to the Lee Census, plus a section for Lee, 1906; Lee, 1924 and Lee, 1931; it was organised this way to ensure that all Lee's copies would be accounted for; and it gave location if confirmed. In June 1990 there were forty-three copies, excluding those in UK institutions likely not to have moved since Lee, of whose location I did not know. The second part listed 'New copies, either confirmed as not in Lee or not yet matched with a Lee number', and gave the location of each copy. The June 1990 version of this second part contained fifty-seven copies in various states of confirmation or uncertainty (including, as it turned out, some duplication of copies and some fragments). A milestone in the search was in July 1991 when enough copies had confirmed locations to enable me to convert this second control tool into a fledgling new census plus two lists--a 'Missing Copies' list, with a column recording clues and next action(s), and an 'Unmatched with Lee' list. These then became the control tools for copies.

Pursuing Missing and Unmatched Copies
The first Missing Copies list had thirty-one copies (plus two copies on the move whose new home had not been confirmed by the owner). The first Unmatched with Lee list--a list of copies whose location I knew, but I did not know whether they were in Lee or
not—had forty-one copies, plus seven Lee numbers which were possible Folger equivalents. I spent the next three years following up clues concerning the missing copies and discovering which known copies were ones in Lee. In the next subsection I illustrate the pursuit with case examples. Here, I describe some of the approaches taken:

1. I wrote to the likely owner, if known, both private and institutional. This not only confirmed the location, but gradually resolved most of the 'Unmatched with Lee' problems. For example, the response from the University of Toronto both confirmed they had a copy and removed Lee 98 from the Unmatched list.

2. If the owner was not known, for copies on the Missing list, I wrote to or phoned the last known owner or descendant and/or the book-dealer if any. Often, the result was negative. For example, for Lee 88 I telephoned the descendant of Colonel Sotheby, the owner in Lee, Census, and I got in touch with Sydney Sabin who was a 'new boy' at (the English) Sabins when the firm bought Lee 88 on 24 July 1924. In this case, no solid new information emerged to aid the search. Similarly, for Lee 115, a letter to Parham Park, a stately home, elicited the response that the volume was not at the house.

3. I put into my database all of Lee, Census; Lee, 1906; Lee, 1924 and information on copies not in Lee, and used this to search for names as they arose—for example from sales records or from the annotated copies of Lee, Census, cited above.

4. I also put into my database the list of Minsheu subscribers referred to above in Chapter 1 and used this to search for the names of previous owners—often given, for example, in a sales catalogue. So far I have not found a match.

5. Focusing on the Folger copies was an obvious strategy. First, because solving problems concerning these copies meant that about a third of the total would be accounted for; it would also eliminate any issues, such as overlap, between other copies and Folger copies. Second, it would fill a major gap in Otness's American listing. Third, fortuitously, a professional librarian, with instant access to any Folger copy and to associated archives, had been charged to prepare a new Folger First Folio catalogue. Extensive correspondence with Donald Farren while he was preparing the catalogue, and accessing this catalogue once it was finished, addressed issues concerning both the Folger copies and some of the missing Lee copies. Indicative of the intricacies and the amount of unknowns is that one letter to Dr Farren in February 1992 involved questions concerning five Folger copies and twenty-nine Lee numbers. He kindly answered all my questions, though was
unable to help much with missing Lee copies. In the end all the issues concerning the Folger copies, including whether they were in Lee or not, were resolved except one (concerning Folger 18).

6. The Rosenbach Museum & Library in Philadelphia is a remarkable resource for Folio hunters: first, many Folios passed through Dr Rosenbach's hands; second, the Library has extensive archives; third, having seen my 'Information Please' notice in The Library, they wrote offering help. In response to questions I sent them, they gave me information on Lee 23, 120, 136 and +4.

7. For missing copies where I had some dated information later than Lee, I tried to close the provenance gap from Lee onwards. For example, a note in Sotheby's Lee helped with Lee 125; a note in Quaritch's Lee helped with Lee 113; and one of the De Ricci's slips at the Folger helped with Lee 144. Also the responses to Folger's solicitation for copies in 1915 gave this later date for the continued ownership of Lee 108 and Lee 135.

8. I distributed the current Missing list to any person likely to be able to help, especially rare-book dealers and relevant academics, as well as to Sotheby's and Christie's in both London and New York. These two firms were extremely helpful concerning a number of copies, for example Lee 134A and Lee 148.

9. Table W in Chapter 1, the record of twentieth-century sales, as it developed, was a constant resource for matching new clues when they arose and for triggering pursuits along new trails. For a number of the sales recorded there I have not identified the copy, though information on each has been checked. For example, one check has been made against the databases mentioned in paragraphs 3 and 4 above, and against the OCLC and RLIN databases. A second has been to review the individual First Folios cited in Trevor Howard-Hill's Index to British Literary Bibliography. A third has been to search a reference work which lists book collectors by hobby; under 'Shakespeare' there are twelve names; none of these names appears in Table W as previous owner, buyer or seller. Despite these checks, because so little information is available on these unidentified volumes, it is premature to begin to consider them as previously unrecorded copies.

Pursuing these and other approaches solved all the Lee-equivalent problems and reduced the 'Missing' list to twenty-one copies, plus one copy, not recorded by Lee,

---

that had emerged in 1919 and disappeared again (the Foley copy). The next approach was to seek help more widely. A second milestone in the search was the publication of 'In Search of Missing Copies of the Shakespeare First Folio' in The Book Collector in the Autumn of 1994. This gave detailed information on each of the twenty-two missing copies and asked for assistance in finding them. The article produced a number of responses, mostly false leads. Its one direct, solid result, so far, was eliciting a letter from Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, which holds the first missing copy mentioned in the Book Collector article, Lee 39. Subsequently, I discovered the thirteenth missing copy mentioned in the article, Lee 145, the search for which is covered in the next subsection. A third milestone was the publication of the 'Provisional New Census' in The Library in March 1995. In this article and in articles I have published since I have invited readers to send me information on missing Folios and Folios not listed. This article produced a variety of responses, but nothing so far calling for changes to be made in the Census. The only modification to the listing in the 'Provisional Census' needed up to now is the shift of Lee 134 and Lee 148 to their new owner in Springboro, Ohio. The conclusions I draw are, first: that there are not many, if any, unrecorded First Folios lurking either in the dust of forgotten repositories or in the light of modern institutional libraries; second that the owners of the missing copies either do not know their copy is being sought or do not want to know; and third, that some of the missing copies may in fact not be missing, but simply not yet matched with located copies.  

Following the Trails of Elusive Copies  

The intent here is to illustrate the kinds of problems (and help) the census-maker encounters and to give enough information for the reader to judge the extent to which the problems have been solved. The first three cases, which I cover only in brief, illustrate long trails and, at the end, exclusion from the census. Finding Lee 145, the fire-damaged Forrest Home copy, was an extended trail. 'The Edward Forrest Home for Retired Actors was disbanded in 1987 and the Library was sold in 1988 or 89' and no one was 'exactly sure' where the Folio was. The Free Library of Philadelphia went to great lengths on my behalf over many months to trace it, discovering that its 'ashes are encased in glass'. The University of Pennsylvania had the glass case, but thought it contained a relic of the Second or Third Folio. The curator went out of his way to inspect the remains as best he could through the glass protection and found the evidence that it was Lee 145--'A little slip of card stock [bears the wording] "... folio

---

51 For avenues of further research I would suggest the following priorities: 1. Continued work to find the twenty missing copies, including more investigation of copies labelled 'non-Lee' or 'non-Lee?' to discover if any can in fact be identified as a 'Lee' copy; 2. Continued search in private and institutional libraries in the UK and in private libraries in the USA; and 3. Continued search in private and institutional libraries in Continental Europe, including Eastern Europe, and Russia.


of 1623." It was the only Lee copy that I dropped from the new Census on account of condition (See Chapter 5, Section A, 'Number of Original Leaves').

The second case concerns the 'Valladolid' or 'Gondamar' copy. This should not be confused with a Second Folio, noted for its expurgations, which went to the English College in Valladolid in the seventeenth century and is now at the Folger. There are various references to the Valladolid First Folio between 1903 and 1930. Lee, in the Census Introduction said that Count Gondamar, Spanish Ambassador in London, acquired a First Folio in 1623, which was 'handed down to his descendants in Spain'. Mrs Ward tells a colourful tale, which involves Sir Thomas Phillipps, the collector, and his future son-in-law Halliwell-Phillipps. She spoke of the volume's perhaps perishing 'barbarously in a bonfire of wastepaper' (257), but also speculates that it may have been transferred with Gondamar's library to Charles III of Spain (258). Although there are inconsistencies between the Lee and Ward accounts, they agree that the volume was examined in Valladolid in the 1830s (Ward, 255) by Don Pascual Gayangos, a Spanish bibliographer. In his 1922 Times article, Lee said that, apparently in 1914, the then Count Gondamar confirmed that the book was still in Valladolid in 1873 and that 'on his grandfather's death in that year, the heirs presented the whole library to the royal family of Spain' (Boas, 190). In his 1923 lecture, Lee said: 'I have lately been trying to get on its track again, without decisive result, though if I am ever able to visit Spain I have clues which might lead to the desired goal' (Lee, 1924, 101). Lee died in 1926 and presumably had not followed up his clues. I have looked for them in his archive at the Stratford Record Office, but so far without success. One guess is that his clues were the reference to the Spanish royal library. Pursuing this lead, I received a letter from Professor A Luis Pujante, Universidad de Murcia, who had written to me about this volume; in response to my question he said (24 April 1998): 'I looked up the "Gondamar English Library" in the Royal Palace in Madrid some years ago, but was disappointed with what was there; except for an early edition of Sidney's Arcadia, most of the books were religious tracts'. The Valladolid volume continues to elude.

Then, there was the longest trail of all, not to find the Indian 'copy', for it has been known to be in Roorkee since 1923, but to try to prove it was not a facsimile. It was first mentioned in an article in TLS. Lee read this article when he was correcting the}

54 Letter from the University of Pennsylvania, 18 November 1994.
56 References to the Roorkee volume include: (1) [No author], 'A First Folio in India', TLS (5 July 1923), 460; (2) [No author], 'A New and Remarkable First Folio', Bookman's Journal (and Print Collector), 8, no. 23 (August, 1923), 159; (3) [No author], 'Is it a First Folio Shakespeare?', Daily Chronicle (29 September 1923); (4) Anthony Spaeth, 'To Be or Not: First Folio or Indian Hope
proofs of his 1923 lecture for the 1924 Gollancz *Studies in the First Folio*. He was sceptical. Sending his corrected typescript he said in the covering note: ‘An unholy suspicion rises in my mind as to whether it is not a reprint of the early 19th century which inexperts have often mistaken for an original . . . . I have made a brief reference to the so-called discovery in a footnote’.57 The volume was in the Conservation Laboratory at the National Museum, New Delhi for treatment, 1989-92, where a kind professor went to inspect it for me, but could not establish its originality. It was then returned to Roorkee: it ‘is now in the Central Library of the University’.58 I had extensive correspondence with the National Museum in Delhi and with the University of Roorkee and even received a copy of a conservation report. But all the details I have received so far could equally describe a facsimile. The Roorkee Librarian could find no watermarks and gave me a distance between chain lines of ‘28-28.5 cms’ (sic); one might expect a measurement of about 21-22 mm (see Plate 6 placed before Part II). He has so far not replied to my follow-up inquiry. I have not included the copy in the new Census, though it remains a candidate. I hope to visit Roorkee. Analogous to the Indian ‘copy’ in the sense that no searching was involved are three copies at the Folger. They have been known to be there, but were not accepted by the Library as copies. An analysis of their contents and condition convinced me they should be (see Chapter 5).

Of course, there were many false trails. I had a letter from the Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin, saying that before the war there were two copies of the First Folio in Berlin, giving the press-marks of each. One copy I confirmed is now in the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, the former East German State Library. The other was in neither institution. A work on German libraries during the Nazi years took me to the Institute of Germanic Studies in London.59 Neither I nor Professor John Flood at the Institute, who kindly helped me search, could find a reference to Shakespeare. He suggested I write to two libraries in Poland, in Cracow and Torun, where materials from German libraries were said to be housed. The reply from each was negative, one with a tone of offended innocence: ‘I would like to stress once more that we have never taken the possession of books evacuated from Germany’. I wrote again to both the Berlin libraries stating the problem. The reply this time was that the other copy was the 1807 facsimile, which—happily not the original—‘gehört leider zu den Kriegsverlusten’. One of the hazards of Folio-hunting is that helpful people want to believe they have seen one. I have pursued false trails, some on good authority, to such varied places as

---


58 Letter from M S Rana, Librarian, 8 July 1993.

59 Peter Vodosek and Manfred Komorowski, eds, *Bibliotheken während des Nationalsozialismus*, 2 vols (Wiesbaden, I 1989, II 1992); vol II has an article (243-71) by Alexander Greguletz on Die Preussische Staatsbibliothek covering the years 1933-36; vol I has an article (25-44) by Werner Schochow on Die Preussische Staatsbibliothek covering the years 1933 to 1945.
Bamberg, Budapest (the 1866 facsimile), Leeuwarden (Holland—the 1807 facsimile), Leningrad, Stockholm, Tenri (Japan—Second, Third and Fourth Folios), Uppsala, and Warsaw. One particularly disappointing false trail concerned Constantine Huygens, who came from Holland, lived in London, was a friend of Donne, translated Donne and was knighted by James I.® A Dutch academic had told me Huygens had owned a First Folio. I searched widely for the evidence, but found none. Huygens’s books seem to have been disposed of at various times; there is no Shakespeare in a sale of his books on 31 December 1701; perhaps the Fourth Folio in a sale of his books on 25 February 1701/2 is the one that was referred to.® To help the reader follow the two remaining cases, I list the ‘players’ at the start.

Trails of Lee +13/Folger 30/Dallas Public Library/Lee +4.® This is a classic case, typical of several others, of pursuing clues, eliminating contradictions, following false paths, and gathering new data until something ‘clicks’.® The journey along the first of what turned out to be three trials was triggered by Otness’s inconsist­ency in saying that the Dallas Public Library copy ‘could be Lee Supplement # 13’ (59) and that Lee +13 is Folger 30 (129). I wrote to Dallas in April 1991 asking which copy they had and, receiving no reply, repeated my letter in December. In the meantime The Rosenbach Museum & Library informed me that Lee +4 had passed through Rosenbach’s hands in 1910 and again in 1916, but there the trail ended. In January 1992, Dallas replied that they ‘could offer no help as to whether our copy is one of those in Lee’, but they enclosed a provenance of their copy from 1772 to 1986 when they acquired it, with a gap between 1916 and 1976. The coincidence of two ‘1916s’—ie, that Lee +4 had been in Rosenbach’s hands in 1916 and that the provenance document said Rosenbach had their copy in 1916—looked promising. The provenance document also gave a clue as to why Otness may have supposed the copy was Lee +13: it says the Dallas copy was purchased in 1772 by John Waller, and Lee +13 is the ‘Waller Copy’, but John Waller would have to have been 150 or more to be the ‘Mr Waller’ Lee says purchased Lee +13 in 1904 (Lee, 1906, 27). In February I wrote to Donald Farren at the Folger asking if Folger 30 = Lee +13; his reply was that Folger 30 was not in Lee; also Lee +13 was not at the Folger. In September 1992 on a visit to the Folger I spoke with

---
® A G H Bachrach, Sir Constantine Huygens and Britain: 1596-1687, A Pattern of Cultural Exchange, 1596-1619 (London and Leiden, 1962), 5-7. Three volumes of this work were planned; after a search, the British Library reported, 9 July 1998, volumes 2 and 3 were not ‘available in the U.K. or abroad’.
® Catalogue of Books Chiefly from the Libraries of John de Wit, Constantijn Huygens, and Frederick Spanheim, 31 December 1701 (BL shelf-mark S.C.331.(3) and 23 February 1702 (shelf-mark 821.g.3.(1). The latter has prices in manuscript: the Fourth Folio, lot 109, fetched £1/2/6.
® ‘+13’ and ‘+4’ refer to the copies with those numbers in Lee, 1906.
® The case of Mrs Rylands’s copy is similar: Lee, 1931, 733, notes that it had come to light in December 1928 and been ‘bought by Mr. Gabriel Wells of New York’. The John Rylands University Library, University of Manchester, confirmed that ‘as a duplicate it was sold . . . in the late 1920s’. Otness says that the Lilly Library, University of Indiana is both ‘Mrs. Rylands’s copy’ and ‘Lee # XLVIII’. The outcome was that Mrs Rylands copy is the Lilly copy and Lee 48 remains at the John Rylands University Library.
Frank Mowery who had rebound the Dallas volume. He described the volume but was unable to help with provenance.

I then sifted through all the information I had gathered on this copy and checked it against information I had assembled on missing copies, especially Lee +4. The eureka moment was finding a correspondence between Lee's description of Lee +4 and the Dallas copy. The most striking correspondence was that Lee wrote 'a note on the flyleaf records that the volume was purchased in 1772 for five guineas', while the Dallas provenance document says the volume was acquired in 1772 for five guineas. I was also able to fill part of the gap in the provenance from auction records: CBVP and BAR reported the sale of a volume in March 1976 with enough information to identify it as Lee +4; and the '1976' date tied in with the Dallas provenance document. In December 1992 I sent my conclusion concerning Lee +4 to Dallas together with the evidence. Not hearing from them, I wrote the following May asking simply if they could confirm the note on the flyleaf. In June they sent me a photocopy of the flyleaf with the 1772 manuscript note as described by Lee.\(^{65}\)

**Trails of Lee 105/Landau/Folger 77/Meisei 3/Wesleyan** The final case, involving three institutions and (as it emerged) three copies, illustrates the intricacies involved in some of the searches. The first trail began in 1990 when I noticed that the Folger First Folio Catalog (1970), for Folger 77, and the Catalogue (1986) of Meisei University, Tokyo, for Meisei 3, both have Lee 105, for which the Lee Census has 'Present Owner Untraced. -- Charles Scribner's Sons' Catalogue, New York, March 1901.'

In May 1990 I wrote to the Folger asking *inter alia* for the Lee numbers of the Folger copies. For some of the copies this information did not seem to exist in the UK, even at the Shakespeare Centre, the Shakespeare Institute or the Birmingham Shakespeare Library. The Folger Library replied that 'our Shakespeare folios have never been cataloged', but enclosed 'a tentative list of folios that correspond to the Lee census'. This list for Folger 77 gave Lee 105. In parallel I sought the 1901 Scribner Catalogue referred to in Lee's Census, but without success. In the summer of 1990 I received the new Otness *Handbook*. As mentioned above his 'Census of Folios in America' does not list the Folger Folios, giving only totals and a general comment (33). In his 'Lee's Census Updated' for Lee 105 he has 'Meisei' and for Lee 110 he has 'Folger (#77)' (127). The latter identification seemed promising because the Folger Catalog (1970) for Folger 77 has 'Clement Mansfield Ingleby copy' and Lee, Census states that Clement Mansfield Ingleby owned Lee 110. In April 1991 I sent to the Folger a list of Lee/Folger corresponding numbers, which I had developed from the Folger's 'tentative list' and from the Otness Handbook, asking for confirmation of the

---

\(^{64}\) Lee, 1906, 20.

\(^{65}\) The Dallas copy is one of a small number of First Folios which have crossed the Atlantic three times. It went to America in 1904. Robin Howard (d 1989), who brought modern dance to the UK, owned it in London. He gave it to the London Contemporary Dance Trust, which he founded; his Trust sold it at Sotheby's, 1 March 1976. It is now in Texas.
correspondences, including Folger 77 = Lee 110. They were unable to give the confirmation but promised the information I needed 'next year after our project to fully catalogue the Folger's Folios is completed'.

In August 1991 I visited the Meisei University Library in Tokyo to inspect the First Folio holdings. For Meisei 3, Meisei List 2 [1991] has Lee 105.66 In looking at Meisei 3 I noted some discrepancies between the volume itself and the description of Lee 105 in Lee's Census. To be able to analyse the discrepancies and similarities, detail by detail, I prepared a comparison table. For an explanation of the design and content of a comparison table, see the introduction to Appendix S 5. Table A below compares Lee 105 with Meisei 3.

---

66 Meisei List 2, [comp Toshihiko Kujirai], 'The First Folios of William Shakespeare' (Kodama Memorial Library, Meisei University: Tokyo [1991]). There is more information on this List and List 1, referred to below, in Chapter 3, Section B, immediately after Table A.
## Table A
### Comparison of Lee 105 and Meisei 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lee 105&lt;sup&gt;67&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Meisei 3&lt;sup&gt;68&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>'Present Owner Untraced. -- Charles Scribner's Sons' Catalogue, New York, March 1901'.</td>
<td>'Acquired in [February,] 1975' (List 1)&lt;sup&gt;69&lt;/sup&gt;. 'Lee's Census: No. 105' (List 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>322 x 211</td>
<td>328 x 203 (AJW &amp; List 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>'fly-leaf and title in facsimile'.</td>
<td>&quot;To the reader&quot;, title-page and other six preliminary leaves in facsimile. . . . Last two leaves in facsimile' (List 2). A6 is on different paper from the other preliminaries (AJW).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>'Signature of James Lakin (d5)' List 2 and AJW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sale: 26/7 October 1952</td>
<td>1. Property of Frederick McDonald Hall and R C Hall (Sotheby's Cat). Signature '(18th Cent.) of James Lakin'. 2. Sotheby's , 237. 3. Robinson. 4. Binding: 'Mor. gt.'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was readily apparent why Meisei 3 had been associated with Lee 105: both are 'Bound by Riviere'; and each has an association with 'Pickering' (row 4). Two other pieces of evidence, however, do not correspond. The metric equivalent of Lee's vertical measurement (the one more likely to be exact) is 322 mm versus the actual measurement of 328 mm, (though perhaps this is within the tolerance of error); and, crucially, whereas Lee says 'fly-leaf and title in facsimile' (row 5), Meisei List 1 says "to the Reader", title page and other six preliminary leaves in facsimile. . . . Last two leaves in facsimile' (my italics). Of course, the italicised information may not have been reported to Lee or, if he inspected the volume himself, he may have missed both the additional facsimile pages and what I noted about A6, but at least in the case of the

<sup>67</sup> Column 2 contains all the information on Lee 105 in Lee, Census. Lee's sizes are converted to millimetres.

<sup>68</sup>The information in rows 2 to 6 in column 3 is from two descriptive lists in the Meisei University Library (referred to here as List 1 and List 2) and from personal inspection of the copy in Tokyo, August 1991 (=AJW). The measurement of the paper is of A1 centred on the central rule which separates the columns. The information in row 7 is copied from Table W in Chapter 1, where: 1. = Seller, 2. = Auctioneer and lot number, 3. = Buyer, in this case Lionel and Philip Robinson, and 4. = Other information.

<sup>69</sup> Meisei List 1, no title, an assemblage of descriptions of Meisei First Folio copies 1 to 9, mostly photocopied from catalogues [c. 1985], with MS addenda.
remaining preliminaries (coming immediately after two whose condition is remarked on), neither seems likely. The James Lakin signature in both rows 6 and 7 identifies the Meisei copy with the volume sold at Sotheby’s in October 1952 and there is nothing inconsistent between that date and Meisei’s purchase date of February 1975. At this stage, influenced by the just-printed Meisei List 2, published with the authority of an academic library, I noted: ‘The volume probably is Lee 105, but there remains a doubt’. A trip to the Folger Library after the visit to Meisei confirmed that Folger 77 = Lee 110. Releasing the claim of Folger 77 on Lee 105 seemed, if anything, to confirm Meisei 3 = Lee 105.

On a different trail I wrote to Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut, to seek confirmation of their holding. Otness says their First Folio is ‘Not in Lee’ (30). Their reply said ‘we believe [our copy]’ is Lee 105. I constructed a comparison table of Lee 105 and the Wesleyan copy, using all the information from Lee, Census and from Wesleyan’s letter and a 1938 sales catalogue they enclosed. (At the time I also put Lee 104 on the table because it was missing and seemed to have some common characteristics with the Wesleyan copy. For the sake of simplicity I omit it here.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Lee 105</th>
<th>Wesleyan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>‘Present Owner Untraced. -- Charles Scribner’s Sons’ Catalogue, New York, March 1901’.</td>
<td>‘Ours is the Borden- Wallace- Chew-Bishop copy. . . . It was presumably purchased by George W. Davison, Wesleyan class of 1892, at the Bishop sale [November 1938] and came to us . . . in 1952.’ (WUL).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>322 x 211</td>
<td>319 x 208 (AG)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>‘bound by Riviere’.</th>
<th>Lev mor, g e, by Riviere (ABPC 19, 591).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘apparently acquired of Messrs. Pickering &amp; Chatto of London in 1900’.</td>
<td>Mor gt, g e by Rivière (BPC 34, 595).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Crimson crushed levant morocco, gilt tooled back, sides with a gilt double fillet border and inner rectangular panels gilt tooled with fleurons an the corners and spaced acorn designs around the outer panel, gilt dentelle borders inside, gilt edges, by RIVIERE’ (AG).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>‘fly-leaf and title in facsimile’.</td>
<td>‘Leaf “To the Reader” and title-leaf in excellent facsimile’ (AG).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘We believe that it is Lee . . . CV’ (WUL).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Column 2 contains all the information on Lee 105 in Lee, Census.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column 3 is from a letter from Wesleyan University Library 27 May 93 (referred to here as WUL) and from the sales catalogue for the Cortlandt F Bishop sale, Anderson Galleries, 14 November 1938 (referred to here as AG). The measurements in inches in AG and ABPC are converted to millimetres.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table shows there is nothing inconsistent concerning provenance (row 2); for size of paper Lee and \textit{ABPC} have identical measurements (one wonders if the \textit{ABPC} source was Lee rather than their own measuring), with the AG measurement being well within the tolerance of error (row 3); the binder is the same and the facsimile leaves match (rows 4 and 5). Wesleyan later reconfirmed that these two leaves were in facsimile. I tried to close the provenance gap from the Scribner catalogue of March 1901 to the Bishop sale of November 1938 and succeeded in establishing a successive provenance backwards from November 1938 to the Mathew Borden sale of February 1913, but not from there back to March 1901. At least there was nothing inconsistent, nothing to indicate that the Wesleyan copy could not be Lee 105.

On yet another trail I had been looking for the missing Landau copy which Lee had recorded in Lee, 1924 (101). My letter in April 1991 to ‘Mme Finely, Villa Landau, Florence’, the owner and address given by the Lee, was returned. In August 1991 at the Folger a De Ricci slip (c. 1930) helped with the information that the volume ‘now belongs to [Horace de Landau’s] niece, Mme Ugo Finly [sic], Villa Alla Pietra, Florence’.\footnote{De Ricci slip—see List of Cue Titles.} A letter to the Villa Pietra elicited no response. Repeated appeals for help to an Italian professor of English literature had similar success. A letter to the British Institute in Florence resulted in a reply which was very helpful on the Landaus’ former villa, including a photograph, but gave no information on their Folio. Finally, research on twentieth-century book auctions produced evidence of four sales of the Landau volume--on 12 July 1948, 15 December 1958, 26 October 1959 and 25 November 1974. The descriptions in the respective Sotheby’s catalogues matched Meisei 3, sealing the identification with a reference to the signature ‘in an 18th century hand’ of James Lakin on leaf d5 (see row 6 in Table A above). It seemed safe to conclude that Meisei 3 = the Landau copy, as well as that Folger 77 = Lee 110. The removal of Meisei 3’s claim to be Lee 105 together with the correspondences of the Wesleyan copy and Lee 105 seemed enough, even without bridging the gap in the former’s provenance, to conclude that the Wesleyan copy = Lee 105.

**C DEALING WITH DOUBTFUL IDENTIFICATIONS**

This Section covers copies with doubtful identifications and examines two possible identifications of an untraced copy (Lee 156). The purpose is twofold: to demonstrate the methods used in dealing with doubtful identifications and to make available a record of organised data on these copies. This record is intended as a ready-reference for any interested person who happens upon additional data and wants to check how it fits, and at the same time as a starting-point for anyone who wishes to go further in proving or disproving an identification. Two different kinds of doubt are involved. One has to do
with an uncertain Lee identification (five cases); the other with an uncertain 'Non-Lee' label (four cases). Three of the five appear in the Provisional Census with their Lee number followed by a '?'—Folger 18/Lee 40?, New York Public Library 6/Lee 41?, and Meisei 8/Lee 104? The other two are Folger 21/Foley and Konan Women's University/Lee 156 or Pierpont Morgan Library 5123/Lee 156. Comparison tables for these are given in Appendix S 5. The four copies in the Census labelled 'Non-Lee?' are Colgate University (NY), Walters Art Gallery (MD), Kyoto Foreign Studies University and the Kamijo Family (Tokyo). Tables giving data on these are in Appendix S 6.

The cases covered are those where the doubt is acknowledged or known. As mentioned elsewhere, there may be other copies in the Census which are not correctly labelled. For example, when entering a copy in the new Census, if the information the owner sent me was completely in accord with Lee, I did not doubt it; yet some owners in providing data may have made assumptions of which I could not be aware. On what thin shreds of evidence some copies are identified is apparent in the cases below. The most likely source of wrong identity or possible duplication is among those labelled 'Non-Lee'. Lee himself sums up this whole problem in the Introduction to his Census:

I have done all I could to avoid duplication of entry in the Census, and have exhausted all available means of research before admitting an 'untraced' First Folio, but it is impossible in so complex an inquiry to counteract every risk of error. (15, n 1)

A cautionary note: by definition the problems addressed below can all too easily be obfuscated by the minutiae of detail. To minimise the elusiveness of meaning, the reader is asked to regard the tables in Appendix S 5 as an integral part of the text and to refer to them in parallel with the text. Frequent row references in parentheses are given to facilitate this.

Lee 40 and Folger 18 (Table C) For Folger 18, Folger Catalogue RLIN says 'Said to be Lee, S. Census, 40 (G. B. Baker-Wilbraham copy)'. Referring to the rows in Table C, one finds (3) a significant disparity between the two measurements of the height and (4) nothing helpful on binding. It is perhaps surprising that Lee can be definite about the binder, while the catalogue says nothing. (5) The Catalogue's detailed description of imperfections does not contradict Lee's 'somewhat worn', but nor is it completely in harmony with it (unless post-Lee restoration has transformed 'worn' by the addition of facsimile and replacement pages). (6) Any doubt that the copies are the same is fed by Lee's silence on such a conspicuous feature as all the preliminary leaves being ruled in MS. (7) It is surprising that Lee does not note that the first two pages are in facsimile, and it is at least a question whether 'letterpress traced over with pen and ink' could be construed to be the same as 'rubricated'. However, the descriptions concur that πA1 is inlaid. (8) They also concur about 'mounting' in connection with the title-page, but only Lee says 'mended' and only Folger Cat RLIN
speaks of ‘Genuine portrait’ and mounting ‘on facsimile title-page’. In row 9, the two descriptions do not cohere at all: if the last four leaves—in common—are toned and seem to come from another copy, why does Lee comment only on the last leaf? Why doesn’t he mention the ‘pen & ink’? Why doesn’t the Catalogue mention the last leaf being backed? Again, a possible explanation is that the volume was restored after the description in Lee was written. (10) It is very surprising indeed that Lee makes no mention of such a noteworthy feature as a 1781 name (presumably an owner) on the ‘flyleaf’. (11) There is nothing inconsistent with the approximate date of Mrs Damer’s acquisition of c. 1790 and the 1781 date associated with a presumed previous owner, but the absence today of the bookplate argues against the copies being the same. It is not only Lee who makes a point of the bookplate as a feature; so does the 1902 Sotheby’s catalogue: ‘with the fine ex libris of Anna Damer by Agnes Berry, 1793’, obviously regarding it as a selling-point. A later owner would be unusual to remove it and the Folger Catalogue makes no mention of any sign of removal.

In short, although the evidence leans somewhat against Folger 18 = Lee 40, it is not conclusive one way or the other. It is possible that Lee did not inspect this volume himself and the person reporting to him was casual or not qualified. On balance, since no other copy claims to be Lee 40, it seems best to leave it as Folger 18 = Lee 40?

Lee 41 and New York Public Library 6 (Table D) The NYPL Catalogue does not mention this copy, presumably because (unlike the five copies in the Catalogue) it belongs to the Berg Collection.73 Otness (47 and 125) says the copy is Lee 41—with no doubt expressed. As row 15 of Table D shows, the distinguished library which owns it raised a question when they wrote to me in February 1994. I inspected the auctioneer’s copy of Sotheby’s Catalogue for the 1902 Hibbert sale, which contained additional copy-specific data, then wrote to the NYPL in March enclosing a version of Table D. The covering letter read in part:

A glance at this table will show you that there is nothing inconsistent between the information you sent me (column 3) and the information from the various sources in column 2, with one possible exception. Lee, with his “fly-leaf washed” (8) and “title with portrait cleaned and repaired”(9), seems to imply that these two leaves have been treated differently. Your “Dedication and title page leaves appear to have been washed and pressed” seems to imply that the two leaves have been similarly treated. Is there in fact any difference in appearance that would help to justify Lee’s separation by a semi-colon and his different wording for the two leaves? The Sotheby’s Catalogue, with its ‘the latter very much so’ (line 16) clearly suggests a noticeable difference in appearance.

Referring to the comparison table: row 11: (a) Are ‘the 3 next preliminaries [after the title-page] neatly repaired in the plain margins’? (b) Is ‘a small portion of the text erased on G2’?

---

Having not had a response by November 1994, I sent a gentle reminder, hoping to encourage a reply by underlining the key questions. In early January 1995, after my provisional Census had gone to press, I received a letter which said in part:

The comment [in their previous letter] that the ‘Dedication and title page leaves appear to have been washed and pressed’ does suggest similar treatment, but the presence of fewer rust stains on the title page leaf would, it seems to me, account for the Sotheby’s catalogue description ‘the latter very much so.’ The following three preliminaries are indeed ‘neatly repaired in the plain margins’ as is ‘a small portion of the text erased on G2’.

With that response, enough doubt was removed for me to be content to cancel the ‘?’ after Lee 41, the only such change I have made between the provisional Census and the Census which appears in this work. Any remaining doubt was eliminated by a letter to Sidney Lee which I found later in the Lee archives in Stratford. It fills the gap in the provenance between Lee’s Dean Sage (Table D, row 14) and NYPL’s Owen D Young (row 16)–see row 15.

**Lee 104 and Meisei 8 (Table E)** Meisei List 2 for Meisei 8 has ‘None’ under ‘Lee’s Census.’ Peter Blayney in an unpublished report on the volume which became Meisei 8 says ‘possibly Lee CIV’.

At the start this case was slightly complicated by the fact that one of the copies of Lee’s Census in the Folger Library has ‘Folger’ beside Lee 104 and Otness for Lee 104 has ‘Folger (?)’ (127). However, Peter Blayney in his report says he has ‘not yet found a Folger copy matching the description’ of Lee 104 (1). When I wrote to Donald Farren in February 1992 to ask if in cataloguing the Folger Folios he had found one corresponding to Lee’s description of copy 104, his answer was a succinct ‘No’. This case was further complicated by the fact that Lee 104, as noted earlier, was a possible candidate to be the Wesleyan copy. Suffice it to say that the Wesleyan copy is now securely united with Lee 105 and Lee 104 remains unattached. It is copy number 17 in my Book Collector article of missing copies.

To compare Lee 104 with Meisei 8 in Table E: (3) The difference in vertical measurement (the one likely to be more accurate) of 13 mm seems to me to be large enough to raise a question, but Blayney felt that the dimensions are ‘well within the tolerance of the Census for untraced copies’. (4) The comparison on binding is a stand-off: one could assume that Lee, in the absence of a Rivière stamp, could judge by the style that it was a Rivière binding, and the style of the Meisei 8 binding is quite consistent with Rivière’s style, but this is not convincing evidence either way. (6) Significantly, both descriptions are in complete accord that (the same) three preliminaries are in facsimile; Blayney’s description and my notes from inspecting the copy are both in accord with Lee’s ‘other preliminary leaves mended and inlaid’. (7) Though Blayney’s close inspection of the portrait shows that Lee is wrong in saying

---

'inlaid', nevertheless the portrait, in Blayney's words, 'appears to be inlaid or mounted'. Thus, for judging whether the two descriptions of the portrait deal with the same copy, there is no material difference between the two. (8) Lee normally notes a facsimile leaf, especially if it is the last leaf, but someone reporting information to him could have omitted this fact. (9) Given the length of Lee's descriptions, it is not surprising that he does not note the extensive marking on Hamlet's speech. (10) On provenance there is no overlap at all and therefore nothing either to draw the copies together or to push them apart.

Overall, the evidence does not point overwhelmingly in either direction. We must take into account that Lee probably had not seen this copy (it was 'untraced' at the time). Thus, omission of details we might expect from him may be irrelevant. Very significantly, as Blayney points out, no other copy in the Census has the first two leaves and the actor list as the only facsimiles among the preliminaries. Further, no other copy has a claim on the Lee 104 identity. If a sale catalogue entry for Lee 104 were to turn up with such specific details as the watermark on T1A1 or the underlining in Hamlet, it would clinch the identification. My conclusion in the meantime is to stay with Meisei 8 = Lee 104?

The Foley Copy and Folger 21 (Table F) This case is particularly interesting because it involves the Foley copy, the First Folio in the 1919 Ruxley Lodge sale dazzlingly described by the Freemans in Anatomy of an Auction.75 For details on the volume, see the last entry in the Census in Chapter 7. The copy was noted by De Ricci to be with Gabriel Wells, the book-dealer, in New York in 1921,76 then disappeared. The Freemans have not traced it since. Peter Blayney has suggested to me that the Foley copy might be Folger 21, which was bought by Gabriel Wells for Folger in March 1922 at the sale of the late J Herbert Foster. Table F in Appendix S 5 presents a comparison table for the Foley copy, the De Ricci slip and Folger 21. There is no contradiction of fact between any two of the three columns. (12) There is no incoherence of dates (though if the Foster/Folger 26 copy is the Foley copy, which De Ricci connects with Gabriel Wells in 1921, Foster could only have bought it shortly before his death). (13) There is no incoherence between the 1919 and 1922 prices. (9) The Freemans' 'The letterpress part of the title “supplied in perfect facsimile by Harris”’ accords with my inspection of the volume. However, there is a disparity between the Freemans' mention of a bookplate and the fact that Peter Blayney (and I) could find no trace of where a bookplate might have been removed from Folger 21. I wrote to the Freemans asking if they had any more information and they had none. Regarding the bookplate, I asked on what evidence they said that De Ricci saw the Foley bookplate? Their reply was that they knew no more than they published. I also asked if there are not some Foley volumes without a bookplate. The answer was

75 Arthur and Janet Ing Freeman, Anatomy of an Auction: Rare Books at Ruxley Lodge (1990).
76 De Ricci slip—see List of Cue Titles.
‘there may be. It’s unlikely, however, for such an important book.’ Finally, I asked:
‘Could not Wells have made the Foley connection orally for De Ricci?’ The response
was in the affirmative. In other words, De Ricci’s note could have been a record of a
conversation with Wells without his having seen the volume; even if he did see the
volume, the Foley connection could have been made in conversation without his seeing
a bookplate. In sum, we have the world’s experts on Foley volumes saying it is
unlikely that such an important book as the First Folio would not have a Foley
bookplate and the world’s expert on First Folios finding no trace of a bookplate having
been removed from Folger 21. This does not disprove that the two volumes are the
same, but it does create a demand for more conclusive evidence before we say with any
certainty they are identical. I have not found this evidence yet. Perhaps Gabriel
Wells’s files, which are said to be scattered among a dozen institutions, would help.

Lee 156 and Lee 38 or 152 (Tables G and H) When I wrote in May 1993 to the
Pierpont Morgan Library in New York concerning their holding, the Associate Curator
of Printed Books and Bindings, Ms Anna Lou Ashby, replied at length, not only
confirming that they have two copies but volunteering the possibility that the untraced
Lee 156—the Asay, Chicago, copy—might be either Lee 38, a former Pierpont Morgan
volume now at Konan Women’s University, Japan, or Lee 152, one of the present
Pierpont Morgan volumes. Table G in Appendix S 5 compares Lee 156 (Asay) with
Lee 38 (Konan): (3) The measurements differ quite a bit. (6-8) Certainly, Lee’s ‘said
to be perfect’ is consistent with my impression of the volume (from perforce an
extremely hasty examination). (9) However, if Lee is correct about the purchase of the
volumes, both around 1870 by different buyers, it does not seem possible that they are
one and the same. For the two provenances to be consistent, Asay would have had to
have sold his volume (a) almost immediately and (b) through Quaritch, a London
dealer; (c) Quaritch would have had to have sold the volume at once to Kennedy, a
New York buyer.

Table H compares Lee 156 (Asay) with Lee 152 (PML): (3) While the vertical
measurements of the paper accord exactly, the horizontal ones differ by 20 mm. Lee’s
‘said to be perfect’ (5) does not accord at all with Pierpont Morgan’s description (5-7)—
e.g., ‘greatly repaired’. (10) However, there is a potentially very strong link between
Lee 152’s ownership mark of ‘Box 3-7’ and the mark of ‘Box 3-1’ in the PML copy of
Spenser’s The Shepherde’s Calendare which was an Asay book. The link is
weakened by the fact that Ms Ashby could not find similar marks in other Asay books
at the Morgan. But the weakening is ameliorated, as Ms Ashby writes, by the
possibility that Asay’s ‘books are marked differently because of his two periods of
collecting’. (11) There is nothing prohibitively inconsistent between Asay’s disposing
of his volume sometime after 1870 and Morgan’s purchasing it in 1896—though this
would mean that Sotheran, a London firm, (if they purchased directly from Asay) dealt
with both an American seller and an American buyer, and possibly that the volume had
to cross the Atlantic twice (from Asay to Sotheran, London, then from Sotheran to Morgan, NYC). The conclusion from the evidence so far is that Lee 156 is very unlikely to be Lee 38 and hardly likely to be Lee 152.

The plot thickens when we learn that Asay owned two First Folios, one in each of his collecting periods. Asay copy 1 escaped the Chicago fire of 1871 because Asay, going on a trip to Europe, had sent his library East for safekeeping with Sabin in Brooklyn. Asay then decided to sell many of his books and Sabin arranged an anonymous sale at Bangs in New York on 18-22 December 1871 (2,619 lots, no less). If there was a First Folio in this sale (I have so far not traced the Bangs catalogue), then it was probably Lee 156, the copy Lee says Asay disposed of sometime after c. 1870. Returning to the US in 1872, Asay purchased another copy of the First Folio, for $5,000, and the Second, Third and Fourth Folios. In 1881, he disposed of a portion of his books to Theodore Irwin of Oswego, New York. When J Pierpont Morgan acquired the Irwin collection in 1900, it contained many of Asay's books. Lee 38, which was owned by Theodore Irwin (as noted in Lee, Census), could not have passed in this way to PML if Lee is correct that Lee 38 has an uninterrupted provenance: Quaritch/Robert Lenox Kennedy/Lenox Library/Theodore Irwin, for there is no space for Asay to have inserted his ownership (Table G, row 9). However, if Asay's First (and his other three?) Folios, which he purchased in 1872, were not in that portion of his books which he sold to Irwin, he could have disposed of it (them?) earlier than 1900, enabling Morgan to purchase it 'with three other folios' (the same three?) in 1896 (Table H, row 11)--that is, Asay 2 = Lee 152. This conclusion is supported by the fact that the owner's mark, known to be Asay's, in the Pierpont Morgan The Shepherde's Calendare is exactly the same type as the mark in Lee 152 (row 10). We have advanced the search for Lee 156's location not at all, but we may have solved the problem of Asay 2's post-Asay history and filled in a gap in the provenance of the Morgan Lee 152.

'Non-Lee?'s Appendix S 6 gives tables on four 'Non-Lee?' copies. The tables reach across the page in the direction of a prospective companion description that will match. Enough space is left for notes on prospective matches. All that can be said about these tables is that whatever information is now available on each copy is presented and labelled and awaits new identifying data with anticipation.

---


78 Lee has 'Irwine', which is not correct.
EXTANT COPIES OF
THE SHAKESPEARE FIRST FOLIO

108 LEXHAM GARDENS,
KENSINGTON, LONDON, W.

February, 1901.

SIR,

THE DELEGATES OF THE CLARENDON PRESS of the
University of Oxford have requested me to contribute a brief
preface to the Collotype facsimile of the copy of the Shakespeare
First Folio, 1623, which they are preparing for publication from the
copy belonging to the Duke of Devonshire, at Chatsworth. The
Shakespeare First Folio is the most valuable book in the literature
of the world. Much uncertainty exists at present as to the precise
number of original copies now extant. The preparation of the
new facsimile by the Clarendon Press offers a favourable opportunity
for making for the first time a census of the copies that now survive.
Such a census, if satisfactorily executed, would be of permanent
value to bibliographers and collectors, and it is hoped that present
owners will facilitate my endeavours to make the record accurate and
exhaustive.

Believing that you will be willing to co-operate in the task,
I venture to enclose a copy of the standard collation of the First
Folio, which is mainly based on that in Lowndes's 'Bibliographer's
Manual.'
Manual. I should be greatly obliged if you would compare your copy with this description, and if you would afterwards fill up the annexed schedule of particulars, answering each of the ten queries.

I should also be glad if you would communicate to me the names of any other owners of the First Folio among your acquaintance.

I shall, naturally, give chief prominence in the published results of the census to copies that are perfect at all points; but I hope to mention all copies, even those that are imperfect, about which information is furnished me.

I remain, Sir,

Yours very faithfully,

SIDNEY LEE.

To Mr. H. C. Roger
Standard Oil Company
New York
USA.
<p>| I. Name of Owner. |  |
| II. Full address of house or library where copy is now kept. |  |
| III. Date of acquisition by present owner. |  |
| IV. Names of former owners, and any information respecting former ownership. |  |
| V. What are the measurements of the copy? |  |
| (a) Height, i.e. size of leaf in inches and fractions of inches from top to bottom of volume when closed. |  |
| (b) Breadth, i.e. number of inches and fractions of inches in top edge of leaf measured when volume is closed, from the point where the stitching is seen to begin, to extreme edge of leaf. |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI. Does your copy show any discrepancies from the annexed particulars of collation? If so, kindly specify them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Are (a) the title, (b) the preliminary matter, and (c) the last leaf in their original condition?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. What portions, if any, of your volume are supplied in facsimile?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. What portions, if any, of your volume are missing?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. What is the general condition in regard to marks of use or age?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Keeper of Early Printed Books:

As part of my PhD thesis, I am currently making a New Census of Shakespeare’s First Folio (1623). I should be very grateful if you would respond to the following.

1. Do you have a copy? Yes / No. If yes:
   (a) Could you please give me either its number in the Lee Census (1902) or its provenance, or both.
   (b) Would you please send me a photocopy of any materials you have which describe the volume, or of bound-in addenda or loose materials with the volume which bear upon its state or its history (enclosing an invoice, of course).

2. Do you have any fragment(s)? Yes / No. If yes, could you please say what they are.

3. Do you happen to know the owner and address of:
   (a) Any copy/ies not in the Lee Census?
   (b) Any (non-Folger) copy in the Lee Census that has changed hands since 1902?

Thank you very much for your help.

Anthony James West
Appendix S 3

Shakespeare’s First Folio

SECURITY AND PRIVACY REQUIREMENTS OF OWNERS

Options for Recording Privately Held Copies in The Census

In order to protect owners of privately held copies, their individual requirements for security or privacy take precedence over other considerations (such as the scholarly world’s desire to have the address of all known copies). Accordingly, private owners can choose the mode of recording their copy in The Census from among the following options (in ascending order of privacy or anonymity):

1. **Standard identification**: Name and address of owner.

2. **Name of owner/no address**
   --placement of copy in The Census according to city/town or (with no city or town mentioned) at the end of the appropriate geographic section.

3. **No owner’s name/no address**
   --placement of the copy in The Census according to city/town or (with no city or town mentioned) at the end of the appropriate geographic section.

4. If the placement of the copy in The Census under options (2) or (3) renders its location too easily identifiable, then:
   --placement in The Census according to the most local geographic unit to which the owner agrees.

5. **No indication whatsoever concerning ownership or location**
   --placement in The Census in an Anonymous section, with no geographic association.

**NOTE:** For options (2) to (5), the confidential information concerning ownership and/or location will be kept either in the file of the British Library’s, or the Bodleian’s, or another appropriate library’s Keeper of Early Printed Books, or in the file of a leading bookseller, or in my file, with—at the owner’s choice—either:

--An undertaking that the owner’s name and location can only be revealed with the owner’s written permission, or

--An understanding that the information may be revealed at the Keeper’s or my discretion.

Anthony James West, English Department, University College London
DETAILED QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COPY INFORMATION

INFORMATION ON SHAKESPEARE'S FIRST FOLIO

(Kindly give any longer answers on a separate sheet, keyed to the numbers below)

1. **Owner/location:** Are the owner of the volume, and its location, precisely the same as the name and address in the covering letter? If no, please correct.
   - Yes □
   - No □

2. **Lee/Non-Lee:** What is the Lee number?
   - If so far as you know this copy is not in Sidney Lee's Census\(^79\) or his Notes & Additions,\(^80\) what evidence supports this conclusion—eg, what does not match with copies Lee recorded?

3. (a) **Date of acquisition?**
   - ___
   
   (b) **Price paid?**
   - ___
   
   (c) **From whom bought or received?**

---


\(^80\) Notes & Additions to the Census of Copies of the Shakespeare First Folio (Reprinted from The Library, Apr 1906, and revised to 24th May, 1906) (Oxford, 1906).
4. **Leaves**—(a) Which if any are:

- Wanting?
- In facsimile?
- From another folio?

(b) Are the leaves washed?  
Yes ☐  
No ☐

(c) Which leaves if any are repaired? And how?
5. **Text:** On which leaves, if any, is the text affected (obscured? missing?) due to:

   - Damage?
   - Marks?
   - Handwriting?
   - Etc?

6. **Press Variants--Have these been recorded?**
   
   - Yes □
   - No □

   If yes, could you please enclose the list.

7. **Marginalia:** Please characterise, and quote any of interest.
8. **Provenance:**

(a) Owners by date?

(b) Bookplates? Signatures? Stamps?

(c) Other indications of ownership?

9. **Binding:**

Material?

Colour?

Decoration?

Edges? (Gilt? Which?)

Size? (For the horizontal measure: from the fore-edge to the joint where the cover hinges) ___ x ___ mm
Condition of binding?

When bound? 

By whom?

Boxed? Yes □ No □
If yes, how? No □

10. **Size of leaf** (using the first page of *The Tempest*, or if it is wanting or unrepresentative, using a leaf representative in size, and saying which leaf):

(a) Vertical measurement at the centre rule: ___ mm

(b) Horizontal measurement at top edge--from the centre of the fore-edge to the point where the paper meets the binding (eg, at the binder’s ribbon): ___ mm

11. **Homogeneity**:

(a) Are some leaves (whole plays?) of different appearance? Yes □ No □

(b) Are some leaves (whole plays?) of different size from the norm? Yes □ No □

(c) If yes, could (do?) these leaves (whole plays?) come from another copy?

12. **Addenda**: Are there any documents of interest which accompany (or are bound into) the volume--concerning, eg, provenance, binding, repairs, etc? If yes, please describe or enclose a photocopy. Yes □ No □
13. **References:** Do you know of references to this volume—eg, in books, periodicals, catalogues, etc?  
If yes, please cite.  
Yes □  
No □

14. **Second, Third and Fourth Folios**

(a) Do you have a Second, Third, or Fourth Folio? If yes, please list, with brief information.  
Yes □  
No □

(b) Is your First Folio part of a set of the four Folios?  
Yes □  
No □

If yes, are the volumes similarly bound?  
Yes □  
No □

15. **Other First Folios**

(a) Do you have another copy/ies of the First Folio?  
Yes □  
No □

If yes, please could you furnish this same information on it/them?  

(b) Do you know of any copies, not in Lee, *Census* or ‘Notes and Additions’, which are now privately owned?**

---

**Private owners can be guaranteed any degree of anonymity they desire in the recording of their copy in the new census.**

---

**Please return to:** Anthony James West  
East Warden, Harbourne Lane, High Halden, Kent TN26 3JF, England
This appendix contains six comparison tables for copies of the First Folio with doubtful identifications. The following explains the design and content of the tables.

A comparison table is a tool for comparing copies when there is a question of identity and when the available information is complex, confusing or inconclusive. It consists of two columns, one for each copy (more columns if more copies are involved); and as many rows as needed, each row containing comparable data. Thus data that is copy-specific can be isolated and placed in juxtaposition to like-data from the other copy (or copies). Further, distinctive data (such as binding) can be recorded in the column of a missing copy where it is conspicuously visible for matching with new data as it is discovered. For the purpose of comparing two descriptions, to prove or disprove they refer to the same copy, only comparable data is selected.

Sometimes when the table is finished, with numerous bits of data sorted, selected, and clearly matched, I have had the reaction of 'Why didn’t you see that before?' The answer always was that I would not have embarked on the lengthy task of making such a table if the solution were already discernible through often large amounts of inchoate information, of different dates, and usually from several disparate sources, who were writing with varying degrees of precision, expertise and reliability for different purposes and different audiences. My experience in preparing these tables is that the act of selecting data for ‘one copy’ as a function of data available for ‘another copy’ quickly highlights relevant evidence, but in difficult cases it is only when the table is complete, when all rows can be individually assessed, that one can make an overall judgement. At any rate the technique has helped solve all the doubtful Lee ascriptions of which I am aware except the ones in this appendix, and little doubt now adheres to one of these (NYPL 6).

The first row identifies the copy (with a number if it has one), the second the owner. The precise, brief and instantly verifiable information on size and binding is given prominence by coming next (in Table D with a section heading). The rows which follow are grouped in two sections, ‘Condition’ and ‘Provenance’. Normally all of the Lee information is given (and this fact is noted); thus the table is self-contained and one need not refer to Lee’s Census. The source of all data is noted for ready checking when the need arises. All measurements given in the source in inches are silently converted to millimetres.
Table C
Comparison of Lee 40 and Folger 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lee 40\textsuperscript{82}</th>
<th>Folger 18\textsuperscript{83}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>314 x 203 mm.</td>
<td>330 mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bound by Roger Payne.</td>
<td>Folger Cat RLIN is silent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Condition**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Somewhat worn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>All preliminary leaves ruled in MS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Flyleaf inlaid and rubricated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Title mended and mounted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Last leaf backed and slightly damaged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{82} The information in column 1 is selected from Lee, Census, 1902. Concerning condition, all the Lee information is given.

\textsuperscript{83} The information in column 2 is selected from Folger Cat RLIN. Concerning provenance, all the RLIN information is given.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>'Sir John Eliot 1781' ('on lower flyleaf'). Sir John Eliot, 1736-86.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Acquired c 1790 by Mrs. Anne Damer, the sculptress. Her 'book-plate, designed by Agnes Berry 1793, is inserted'. Folger Cat RLIN is silent on whether there is any sign of a plate being removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Acquired by Pickering and Chatto for £620 (Lee). Sold Sotheby's 17 March 1902 for £620 to Pickering and Chatto (Sotheby's Cat).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Purchased by Folger May 1921 for $13,000 (Folger Price List).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Lee 41</strong>[^1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>330 x 209 mm (Lee). 'Measuring close on 330 by 209 mm.' (Sotheby's Cat).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Binding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Lee 41</strong>[^1]</th>
<th><strong>New York Public Library 6</strong>[^2]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>'well bound by Bedford'.</td>
<td>Binding by Bedford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>'Red morocco super extra... vellum fly-leaves and joints' (Sotheby Cat).</td>
<td>'Red morocco'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>'Back and sides covered with rich gilt ornaments in the antique Lyonnese style' (Sotheby's Cat).</td>
<td>'Elaborate gilt stamping of acorn/flower motif'.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Condition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Lee 41</strong>[^1]</th>
<th><strong>New York Public Library 6</strong>[^2]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>'Condition is good'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>'fly-leaf washed'.</td>
<td>'Dedication and title page leaves appear to have been washed and pressed'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>'title with portrait cleaned and repaired'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>'several margins elsewhere mended'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>'Leaf of verses much washed, as well as the title containing the portrait, the latter very much so, and is by no means of a satisfactory character; the 3 next preliminaries are neatly repaired in the plain margins; a small portion of the text erased on G2; corners of 3 ll. split and neatly repaired; one or two rust holes, and stains' (Sotheby's Cat).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^1]: Source: Lee, *Census*, unless otherwise stated. All the information in the *Census* is given. The Sotheby's Catalogue is for the 12 April 1902 Hibbert sale.

| 12 | 'Probably acquired by Hibbert c 1870. 'Colonel Edward George Hibbert Dean Sage Copy.' |
| 13 | 'Sold with his library, after his death, at Sotheby's for £1050 to Pickering & Chatto, booksellers of London, April 12, 1902'. |
| 14 | Acquired by Dean Sage, Albany, NY, in 1902. Still owned by his widow in April 1903 (Lee, 1906, 11n). |
| 15 | Letter to Sidney Lee from Edgar H Wells, New York, 19 January 1926: 'We have recently sold the Hibbert-Sage-Cooper copy of the first folio (No. 41 of your Census) to Mr Owen D Young . . . This copy was sold by Pickering and Chatto of London to the late Dean Sage of Albany, N. Y. On his death some years ago, it passed to his daughter, Mrs. James Fenimore Cooper, also of Albany, whose husband is the grandson of the American novelist. Mr Young is Chairman of the General Electric Company.' |
| 16 | 'Came to the Berg collection in 1941 as part of Owen D. Young collection purchase. No indication in Berg records of Lee Census number. Is this Lee xli?' |

---

Table E
Comparison of Lee 104 and Meisei 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lee 104&lt;sup&gt;87&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Meisei 8&lt;sup&gt;88&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>'Present Owner [1902] Untraced. -- The Fiske Harris Copy'.</td>
<td>Meisei University Library Hino City, Tokyo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>321 x 206.</td>
<td>308 x 207.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Condition**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A made-up copy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>'[πA1-πA1+1 and πA5+2] in facsimile; ... other preliminary leaves mended and inlaid'.&lt;sup&gt;πA1-πA1+1 and πA5+2 in facsimile. πA1 has fleur-de-lys watermark (PB).&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>'portrait inlaid'. The portrait appears to be inlaid or mounted; in fact, it was pasted on to the leaf before it was printed (PB).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3b6 is largely in facsimile but with an original fragment inlaid; this leaf is individually tipped to the binding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hamlet's 'solid flesh' speech on nn5&lt;sup&gt;v&lt;/sup&gt; extensively marked, mostly by underlining (PB).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provenance**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>'bought c 1860 of Pickering, London, by S. Rider, bookseller of Providence, who sold it to C. Fiske Harris of that city. [Winsor, No. 6.] After Fiske Harris's death it was sold in 1883 to a collector in Kentucky.' Bookplate of Wentworth Butler. On binders' leaves: (1) Label: 'E 7'. (2) 'MR 1940 NO. 8'. (3) MS: 3[?]/276'. (4) MS erased, which once read 'Two Hundred and Fifty Pounds'. Owners: (1) Wentworth Butler (2) Lord Astor (3) Purchased by Meisei in 1985 from John F Fleming, dealer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>87</sup>Column 1 contains all the information on Lee 104 in Lee, Census.

<sup>88</sup>This column combines data from Peter Blayney's unpublished report on Lee 103, cited above (= PB), Meisei documents and notes from my own inspection of the copy.
# Table F

Comparison of the Foley Copy, De Ricci Slip and Folger 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Foley Copy[^89]</th>
<th>De Ricci Slip 189[^90]</th>
<th>Folger 21[^91]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Present owner unknown</td>
<td>Foley copy was at Gabriel Wells's, 1921</td>
<td>Folger Shakespeare Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;modern morocco&quot; (61).</td>
<td>Red goatskin over millboards by Rivière (Conservationist's note). Rivière stamp at foot of binder's leaf.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Condition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;a decent copy&quot; (61)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;A very fine and perfect copy...Condition sound and good&quot; (60).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>&quot;It was obviously a &quot;satisfactory&quot; but not altogether excellent copy&quot; (124).</td>
<td>Very good copy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot;verses inlaid&quot; (61).</td>
<td>The verses are mounted (AG).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Preliminary leaves and many text leaves are remargined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>&quot;a remarkably fine impression of the Portrait&quot; (60). &quot;The letterpress part of the title &quot;supplied in perfect facsimile by Harris&quot; (61).</td>
<td>'Genuine portrait, letterpress title in facsimile.' Excellent impression of the portrait. Portrait mounted. Letterpress of title in facsimile.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>&quot;Last Ils. restored&quot; (61).</td>
<td>Last page partly in facsimile.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^89]: Source: Arthur and Janet Ing Freeman, *Anatomy of an Auction*. Quotations within quotations are from the Ruxley House Pickering sale catalogue.

[^90]: This column has all the information on the De Ricci slip.

[^91]: Information from examining the volume, from Folger 21 provenance file in the Folger Catalogue Department and from AG. AG = Anderson Galleries, Catalogue for the 14 March 1922 Sale of the Library of the late J Herbert Foster of Providence, R I.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table G
Comparison of Lee 156 and Lee 38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lee 156&lt;sup&gt;92&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Lee 38&lt;sup&gt;93&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Present Owner Untraced. - The Asay [Chicago] Copy.</td>
<td>Konan Women's University Kobe, Japan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>321 x 223 mm.</td>
<td>300 x 197 mm. 'said to be “the smallest copy” known’ (Lee). Occasionally top rule, and even top of running title, trimmed (AJW).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Together with two F2s, one F3 and two F4s, each differently bound (AJW).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Condition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>‘said to be perfect.’</td>
<td>Clean copy. Text may be perfect. Excellent condition (AJW).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Preliminaries all clean (AJW).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>‘title partly in facsimile’ (Lee).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>‘Winsor, No. 18’.</td>
<td>‘Winsor, No. 10’ (Lee).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>92</sup> This column is quoted from Lee, *Census*, and contains all the information given there.<br><sup>93</sup> Source: description of Lee 138 in Chapter 3. Lee = *Census*; AJW = from my inspection of the volume in August 1991; PML = Letter from Pierpont Morgan Library, 21 July 1993.<br><sup>94</sup> Lee has ‘Irwine’; Irwin is correct.
## Table H
Comparison of Lee 156 and Lee 152

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lee 156&lt;sup&gt;95&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Lee 152 = PML 5123&lt;sup&gt;96&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | Present Owner Untraced.  
| 2 | Paper: 321 x 223 mm. | 321 x 203 mm. |
| 3 | Binding: silent. | 330 x 223 mm.  
   W. Pratt. Dark green morocco, gilt. |

### Condition

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5 | 'said to be perfect.'  
   This copy has been washed, pressed and greatly repaired. |
| 6 | The preliminary leaf is heavily restored. |
| 7 | Title leaf is probably from another copy; it is heavily restored including pen facsimile work and is tipped in. |

### Provenance

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A signature and date below the portrait have been erased--might have read something like: George ?York ?1696.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Title-page annotation in ink: 'Ex Bibliotheca (?N). H. Hadermann'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The only potential ownership mark on the verso of the front endsheet is: 'Box 3-7'. I have examined some of our Asay books and find that a copy of Spenser's <em>Shepherd's Calendar</em> has a similar mark: 'Box 3-1'. The others have no such mark.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11 | 'acquired by E. G. Asay, of Chicago, c 1870, and since disposed of.'  
   1896 purchased by PML from Sotheran with three other Folios. |
| 12 | 'Winsor, No. 18'. |

<sup>95</sup> This column is quoted from Lee, *Census*, and contains all the information given there.

<sup>96</sup> Source: All of this column is from Pierpont Morgan Library letter, 21 July 1993.
Appendix S 6

FOUR COPIES IN WEST CENSUS
LABELLED 'NON-LEE?'

Table I
Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, MD—Non-Lee?/West 148

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Binding: 'Nineteenth-century (?) gold-tooled crimson morocco by H. Stamper'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>'Lines before title reprint. Original portrait inlaid in fac-simile title page'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>'In the hand of the former Keeper, Dorothy Miner. &quot;Title portrait from a Fourth Folio inlaid&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>'Preliminary leaves to Catalogue partly from other copies and partly in fac-simile [6 leaves]'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>'Catalogue repaired'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>'Many repairs to text pages, especially at the beginning (through The Tempest) and end'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>'Text perfect except four leaves of Cymbeline in fac-simile of (?) Harris'.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provenance

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>'Front fly-leaf inscriptions include: &quot;3422&quot;, &quot;lyre/1000&quot;. The longer fly-leaf inscription concerning the book's condition appears to be in [Henry Walter's] hand.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>'Came from the library of Henry Walters'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>'I rather suspect that the inscription &quot;lyre/1000&quot; may be by Leo S. Olschki, the Florentine book-dealer who sold Walters most of his collection of incunables, among other things. 'Nothing further to tell . . . as Henry Walters seldom kept records of his purchases.'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

97 Source: letters from The Walters Art Gallery (18 April 1994 and 6 December 1994).
Table J
Case Library, Colgate University, Hamilton, NY
--Non-Lee?/West 161^98

Table: Binding: ‘Brown morocco’ (Otness, 45).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Binding: ‘Brown morocco’ (Otness, 45).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 In good shape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 First two leaves are supplied in facsimile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Pages generally free from stains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Some scribbling on two pages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Each page of the Folio is surrounded by rules.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Contains the bookplate and signature of John Ord, Lincoln’s Inn. His crest, on the bookplate, is three fishes over a stag’s head.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 ‘Ravenscroft - John Ord copy’ (Otness, 45).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Colgate has no records before 1942.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Gift to Colgate University by James C. Colgate in 1942.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

^98 Source: letter (27 May 1993) from Special Collections Department, Colgate University, except the two Otness items noted.
## Table K

**Kyoto Foreign Studies University, Kyoto, Japan**

---*Non-Lee*/West 1999

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>319 x 202. Much variation in paper size throughout the volume.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stamp: 'Bound by Hayes Oxford'. |
| **3** | One of a set of four, each bound differently. |

### Condition

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>A made-up copy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>A5: crown watermark much larger (50 x 63) than normal F1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **6** | Facsimile: A1-B4, J6, A2, e3-4?, q5, t1, 342-4, 341, bb5,  
nn6, pp5, v2-6, xx5-6 and 3a2-3b6. |

### Provenance

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **7** | f1v MS note (ink) '1606'.  
k3 bottom margin (ink) 'Show as Johnston'.  
l6 top margin (ink) 'Henry ----?'. |
| **8** | Binder's leaves: [ivv] Stamp--10073' [v7] Pencil--64391'. |
| **9** | [ii v] Bottom right (pencil): 'UNDDI-'.  
[iii v] Ink note on prices of two other copies, one of which was sold in 1869.  
No other provenance information. |

---

99 Source: notes on Kyoto copy taken in August 1991.
**Table L**

Kamijo Family, Tokyo--Non-Lee?/West 212**100**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Binding: red morocco gilt, panelled sides and spine,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gilt edges, by Rivière.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Preliminaries in lithographic facsimile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thirty leaves supplied from Second Folio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seventeen leaves supplied from Third Folio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A pink stain caused by damp in the upper outer corner of most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leaves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Last five leaves in lithographic facsimile.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provenance**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Offered in catalogue for £6,400.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Purchased by Mr Kamijo, who died c. 1981. By provision of his will, access to volume proscribed for thirteen years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Sources:** the reference in row 6; for row 8, Mr Mutsuo Nitta, President, Yushodo Co Ltd., Tokyo (August, 1991).
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What to Count as a Copy and Copies 80 to 84 at the Folger
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B WHAT TO COUNT AS COPIES AT THE FOLGER

APPENDIXES:
D 1 DETERMINING WHAT TO COUNT AS A COPY
D 2 SUPPLEMENTARY BIBLIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION ON FOLGER 80, 81 AND 82

TABLES:
(Table A is in Appendix D 1; Table B in the text.)
A Determining What to Count as a Copy
B Comparison of Folger 80, 81 and 82
INTRODUCTION

'How many copies are extant?'—the question I most frequently encountered during my census research—seems a simple enough question. The answer is not. Successive scholars have each given a number, but none appears to have defined what they counted as copies. In 1902, Sidney Lee recorded 158 copies, but did not address this issue in the Introduction to his Census. In practice, he was very inclusive. As we saw in Chapter 4, two would-be census-makers gave their numbers: De Ricci about 180 (in 1921) and 193 (c. 1932), and Smith 190 or more (in 1927). In 1963, Charlton Hinman hazarded that 'some 230-odd [copies] still survive'. In 1991, Peter Blayney at first did not depart materially from Hinman: 'It is usually estimated that about 230 or 240 copies... survive.' He then added: 'The number of original copies of which parts survive [in made-up copies] is probably closer to 300.' As it happens, though they variously concern themselves with the problems of incompleteness, damage, made-up copies, etc, none of these scholars defined what they counted as a copy. In this chapter I show how I decided what to include in the new Census. Then, by way of illustration, I examine three unrecognised copies at the Folger.

A DECIDING WHAT TO COUNT AS A COPY

In defining what to count as a copy I began by developing formal criteria for copy-status based largely on condition. However, such criteria strictly applied would admit Folios numbered only in the tens. Because Folios survive in such a wide variety of condition after 370-odd years of typically tough treatment and because there are claims to copy-status from factors having nothing to do with condition, I abandoned tight criteria. Instead, for determining what to include in the Census and for counting Folios, I used seven tests or considerations. These are variously applicable depending on the case. With a bias towards inclusiveness, this approach admits all Folios of whose whereabouts scholars might want to know. Some readers may find Appendix D 1 helpful; it provides a brief summary of the considerations and how to use them.

1) Lee Number or Folger Number. For the Census and for reckoning copies, I count a Folio with a Lee number (in Lee, Census or Lee, 1906) as a copy. In myriad documents from scholarly articles to book auction records, these numbers have been universally used. It would be perverse after over ninety years to exclude copies with a Lee number. However, it begins to illustrate the intricacy of the task when even that putatively simple conclusion requires three exceptions, embracing nine Lee numbers. The first exception eliminates Lee 157 and 158: as these were already 'stated to have

---

1 Hinman, 1, 39, n 3.
2 Blayney, 40.
3 Theoretically, provenance would be one of the considerations (to capture marginal copies owned by famous persons, for example), but there appear to be no volumes with a claim to copy-status through provenance which do not already have the status through another consideration.
been destroyed' in 1902, no one could claim they are extant copies. The second exception is Lee 145, the Forrest Home copy, which is covered below under the second consideration (‘Number of Original Leaves’).

The third exception embraces Lee 54, 104, 122, 139, 153 and 156. In 1902, these were labelled ‘Untraced’ and they are still untraced. As no one appears to have known for around a hundred years where any of these copies are located, it seems reasonable to exclude them. Of course, if any turn up they would be immediately re-admitted. Further to illustrate the intricacies of this subject, one of these copies may have done so, since it is possible that copy 8 in the Meisei University Library, Tokyo, is Lee 104. (This is examined in Chapter 4, Section C.) Meisei 8—one I examined—is definitely a copy. Whether it is Lee 104 or not is immaterial for the purpose of counting it, of course, because it is included in its own right. We simply need to be aware that another copy may turn up with a claim to being Lee 104.

Apart then from these nine (or eight) Lee numbers, any Folio with a Lee number counts as a copy. However, it must be recognised that this statement lets in, for example, Lee 144 (the Pauncefort-Duncombe copy, which in 1902 had only 175 leaves and of which I do not know the present location) and Lee 141 (the Dulwich College copy which has only 238 leaves and none of the tragedies, and is bound in two volumes).

The argument for the Lee copies applies similarly to the Folger copies. Henry Clay Folger personally assigned numbers to seventy-nine of his copies before he died in 1930. For nearly seventy years the Shakespeare community has known these copies by their Folger number. It would be equally perverse to exclude any of them. But in saying this we have to recognise that four of the seventy-nine, Folger 40, 57, 65, and 74, are ‘unbound collections of loose “scrap” leaves’, and that, out of 445 text leaves, Folger 66 and 74 have only about 169 and 193, respectively. At the same time Folger 49 ‘is disbound, in case, with A1-4 and 3b2,3 loose’. Regarding loose leaves (or in this case loose quires) and the issue of whether a copy is bound or not, Peter Blayney commented on this copy in the letter just cited:

Copy 49 is slightly more questionable, because although there’s virtually no binding left, in this case we’re dealing with what was once a single copy. Both boards are missing, and the few remaining scraps of leather from what was once the spine are all detached. Most of the leaves, however, are still stitched to broken remnants of the original cords, and form three large fascicles (fragmentary A5 and A6-l6, N1-61, and g2-bbb1). It could, I suppose, be argued (rather optimistically) that these sections are still somehow ‘intact’. Quires K, L, and M are now loose, having been separated from the rest for the [1991 Folger First Folio] exhibition—this copy was the one shown ‘exploded’ in the first case [in the exhibition].

---

5 Folger Cat RLIN.
This quotation graphically exemplifies the issues involved in deciding where to draw the line on what to include as a copy.

In summary, the mere fact of having a Lee or Folger number argues strongly for granting copy-status, but this admits to the count copies which otherwise one might exclude. (The opposite issue, three copies at the Folger without numbers, is discussed in the next Section.)

(2) Number of Original Leaves. The most important consideration, especially for the textual scholar, together with number five below (known location), is the number of original (i.e., 1623) leaves of text. If the test for a copy were that it must be complete with all original leaves, the number of copies would be small. Lee's Census, for example, records only forty-one copies with all leaves present and all from a First Folio. All the other copies are perfected with leaves from later Folios or with facsimile leaves, or they lack leaves. Some cut-off point has to be chosen below which a volume is not counted as a copy. As a working guideline, I arbitrarily chose fifty percent of the 445 original text leaves. It turned out that this cut-off point had little importance. To my surprise I came across few fragments in my census searches, though there are many miscellaneous fragments at the Folger. I know of no large fragment not mentioned in this Chapter.° The only copy with a Lee number to be excluded under this consideration is Lee 145, the Forrest Home copy. In his Census, Lee recorded it as 'Nearly destroyed by fire [in] 1873'. Recently, the 'ashes' and 'charred pages' have been reported to me as 'encased in a glass box . . . . We cannot enter it . . . . What I can see of the central portions of the few charred pages that are visible at all is legible, [but] the object as now constituted cannot be used as a reading copy even though it has legible bits on each (?) leaf.'

Other considerations to take into account when measuring relative completeness are the number of complete plays present, the number of the original nine preliminaries present, whether the original title-page with the portrait is present and whether the final leaf of Cymbeline is present.® These considerations might come into play for assessing a marginal volume.

(3) Whether Bound and Whether Bound in One Volume. Most book owners, if they counted their books, would include only bound volumes. One would, of course, for most purposes prefer a Folio to be bound, and bound in one volume as the original was, but I argue that neither of these conditions needs to be met in order to count a Folio as a copy. From the point of view of at least the textual scholar, it is immaterial whether a copy is bound or not. As indicated above, four of the seventy-nine Folger

---

° A portion of a First Folio containing 165 leaves appears in Sotheby's Catalogue, 26 July 1987, lot 202. Certain defective copies are listed in Chapter 1, Appendix S/P 12, in the second bullet point before Table X.


® As an indication of the casualty rate for the first leaves and the last leaf of the volume, Peter Blayney gives the following count for eighty-two copies at the Folger: only nineteen copies have A1; twenty-six copies have part or all of T-P; and thirty-seven any part of 3b.
copies are not bound at all. Lee 146—one of the Sutro copies in San Francisco—is bound in twelve separate volumes (including one volume containing three fragments). These Folger copies and others would be excluded if we required a Folio to be bound, and the Sutro copy and others would be excluded if we required a Folio to be bound in one volume. The Sutro copy, and copies where sections of the Folio conjoined in the correct sequence are preserved in folders, represent a sort of half-way house towards being bound, as we shall see in the next Section. Certainly, the experience of using them approximates to that of handling a bound volume.

A related consideration is whether the binding is original. Because so few Folios survive in their original binding one would lean towards granting a marginal volume copy-status if it had a seventeenth-century binding.

(4) Original Leaves Originally from the Same Copy. This cumbersome heading is used rather than, simply, ‘From the Same Copy’ because this latter phrase could include made-up copies. The point is to distinguish ‘originally together’ from ‘made-up’. One should distinguish here between leaves and sheets, for a sheet (of two conjoined leaves or forme-mates) has greater bibliographical integrity than two leaves conjoined in the 1623 volume, but now found from different sheets. However, most descriptions of Folios do not make this distinction. In these cases, in the absence of examining a volume, one has to be satisfied with a leaf count.

Most people would agree that a volume which has been completed with a few leaves from another First Folio is a copy, as is the case with most of the generally accepted copies. But the question becomes more difficult if a volume is made up—of complete plays, or of sheets, or of single leaves—from two or more copies.

The essential point here is to take a position on whether, in order to count as a copy, a volume has to be made up of the sheets originally bound together. I argue as follows. The mix of sheets in any copy of a Folio is due entirely to the happenstanes of the production process—e.g., which sheets happened to be taken in which order for perfecting, which order for folding and being hung up to dry, which order for being taken down from drying and stacked, and which order for binding. Therefore, if later someone makes up a volume of original sheets which happen to come from different copies, this volume has scarcely less claim to copy-status than it would have had if these sheets had been bound together in the 1620s. Intuitively one feels the volume’s claim is stronger to the extent that it contains complete plays, and is weaker to the extent it contains individual leaves.

Interestingly, someone faced Lee with the very issue discussed here and he sidestepped the answer (he does not distinguish between sheets and leaves, and what he calls ‘leaves’ in the first sentence are in fact pages):

[In 1923] I heard from a correspondent in Washington that he had got together, by dint of persistent search in all parts of the world, eight hundred and ninety-eight out of the nine hundred and eighty leaves of which the perfect volume originally consisted. The leaves, my correspondent tells me, are of all shapes
and sizes, and he asks me whether I should admit into a new edition of my Census this shapeless conglomeration of scraps. I am not sure about my answer. (Lee, 1924, 82)

I have not identified this volume, but would count it as a copy.

(5) **Known Location.** An obvious test for a copy is that its location is known, or at least that it is likely to turn up sometime. All copies that I count have a known location except thirteen in a category of their own and one known copy without an address (the Kajimo copy in Tokyo). The thirteen were among those recorded by Lee, but I have still not found them. I label them ‘Unfound’ to distinguish them from the ‘Untraced’ volumes in Lee’s *Census*. All but two (Lee 99 and 115) have been sighted since 1902. Given this and my success so far in reducing my ‘Unfound’ list, it seems probable that some, perhaps most, will come to light again. For this reason they are counted as copies.

It must be admitted that there is a fine line between the six ‘Untraced’ copies excluded in (1) above and the thirteen ‘Unfound’ copies included here. For example, there has been similar success in reducing the ‘Untraced’ list—from fourteen in 1902 to six now, and Lee may have had news of his ‘Untraced’ copy 122, for he says in 1906—wrongly as it happens—that it was in Folger’s possession. The distinctions between the two sets are that the ‘Untraced’ were already labelled ‘Untraced’ in 1902, and that with the possible exceptions of Lee 104 and Lee 122 they have not been sighted for at least twenty- or thirty-odd years longer than the ‘Unfound’.

(6) **Condition of the Leaves and the Text.** This is a key consideration. However, it poses difficulties because most copies are not completely, precisely and authoritatively enough described for one to be able to rely upon the description in applying a test of condition. If one were to attempt to test condition by correspondence, as I know from experience, the more precisely one defined the test for the sake of reliable results, the more one would risk failing to gain the co-operation of busy librarians. As mentioned elsewhere, I hope in due course to address this problem. In the meantime, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, I assume that the condition of copies I have not seen is such as not to disqualify them from counting as a copy. Nevertheless, it is clear that at some point the degree of poor condition must shift a volume from ‘copy’ to ‘fragment’. Such I have presumed is the case of the Forrest Home copy, referred to in (1) above.

(7) **Owner’s Decision.** An owner’s decision on copy-status by itself might be suspect due to assumed lack of objectivity. But if the owner has authority, say a research library, the decision is hard to ignore. It is only relevant in marginal cases.

In short, to determine what to count as a copy, any of seven considerations may be relevant, different considerations may apply to different copies and subjectivity cannot be avoided. As mentioned above, the considerations are summarised in Appendix D 1.
B WHAT TO COUNT AS COPIES AT THE FOLGER

Deciding what to count as copies at the Folger Shakespeare Library illustrates the issues involved in deciding what to include in the new Census. Strangely, the exact number of Folger First Folios has been an unsettled question. As recently as 1989, Paul Werstine wrote in *The Library*: 'Exactly how many copies the Folger holds has not yet been established'. I argue that the Folger holds three more copies of the First Folio than the traditional seventy-nine to which Henry Clay Folger personally assigned numbers. In doing so I follow Peter Blayney, who concluded in 1991 that 'the best strictly numerical answer to the question is 82'. In 1992 Donald Farren completed a new catalogue of the Folger First Folios; despite Blayney, the Catalogue includes, and seems to confirm, only seventy-nine.

To determine what to count as a copy at the Folger, as with all copies, one needs to be judiciously pragmatic. Charlton Hinman concluded, because of their varying condition, 'no really exact whole number can be given'. While correct, that position does not help to decide what to count as a copy or what to include in a census. Peter Blayney describes the reality with customary precision: 'It is a collection that includes both obvious copies and obvious fragments, but which ranges across a whole spectrum of completeness from perfect copies to defective single leaves.' It is not a question of black or white, but a wide range of greys between black and white. The purpose of the 'considerations' outlined in the previous Section is to provide guidelines for determining in the misty grey where to draw the line.

On the one hand, we have already seen that Folger 40, 57, 65 and 74 are not bound and that Folger 66 and 74 lack many leaves. They gain entrance to the Census through having a Folger number. Despite their condition these 'copies' have scholarly value—for variant analysis for example. They have historical value through their provenance. They have had a numbered identity for nearly seventy years. So long as one can ascertain the condition of each, which the new Catalogue makes easy to do, it would serve no useful purpose to challenge their copy-status.

On the other hand, how would someone familiar with the typical condition of First Folios regard a 'copy' such as this?

*Thirty-one of thirty-six plays present, all complete with original leaves*

---

10 Blayney, 46.
11 Hinman, 1, 7, n 1.
12 Blayney, 46.
387 original leaves all from the same copy, plus eight leaves stored separately but 'identifiable as from'\(^{13}\) the same copy, for a total of 89 per cent of the text leaves.

- Good margins and measurements (325 mm \( \times \) c. 209 mm), with no leaves varying substantially from these.
- All leaves in similar good condition, clean with very few marks, small repairs (mostly to the inner margins only), no tears or missing corners, no holes touching the text, text virtually unimpaired throughout.
- The plays sewn together in sets of one, two, and three (as if ready for binding).
- Location known.

Such is an unnumbered, uncatalogued set at the Folger, beautifully preserved in twenty uniform burgundy folders, with 'SHAKESPEARE/[NAME OF PLAY(S)]/1623' gilt-stamped on the front cover of each folder. I believe most bibliographers, textual scholars, and curators of early printed books, recognizing its scholarly value, would call this a copy, unless they insisted that a 'copy' must be bound.

In addition to the Burgundy set, the Folger has a Red set and a Green set, all provisionally named by Peter Blayney, after the colour of their folders or bindings. Each folder or volume contains one to three plays--more than one play whenever one play ends on the recto and the next starts on the verso. None of these sets is catalogued. Following Blayney's conclusion that these three sets deserve 'to be counted as copies',\(^{14}\) I number them Folger 80, 81, and 82 in my census. (My use of italics here is to indicate that these numbers have--as yet--no Folger authority.) The numbers are useful not only for reference purposes but also for highlighting the fact that in different ways these Folios have as much or more claim to copy-status and scholars' attention as some of their seventy-nine fellows. Cataloguing and numbering them would indicate this to the scholarly world.

An objection to the introduction of new numbers might be that they lack Henry Folger's authority. In my view, this objection has little weight. These copies deserve to be treated by the scholarly world in the same way as the other seventy-nine, not as fragments, and that they deserve a clear reference that associates them in a consistent way with their fellows.

Hinman lends his authority to the inclusion of Folger 81 and 82 in the count: 'Precisely 79 have been serially numbered; but one of these consists of a few leaves only, whereas the collection also includes two complete sets of the plays bound individually, as well as many other fragments of various sizes'.\(^{15}\) But he only adds to the confusion about the number of copies by concluding, 'Thus at least as good a case

---

13 Peter Blayney unpublished notes, of which he generously gave me a copy.
14 Blayney, 46.
15 For the record, the two sets of plays are not 'complete'. See table below. Also, as noted above, they are not 'bound individually'.
can be made for 80 as for the semi-official "79" that is often seen. He seems to have subtracted Folger 66 due to its 'few leaves', but not Folger 74 which as noted in Section A above is almost as deprived. Further, his arithmetic indicates that he includes Folger 81 and 82 ('two . . . sets of the plays bound') but not Folger 80.

Although Hinman was ready to accept 81 and 82 and not 80, the cases for including 81 and 82 are not so clear as the case for 80. Facts about all three, based on a detailed examination, are presented in the following table to permit ready comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Name</th>
<th>Folger 80</th>
<th>Folger 81</th>
<th>Folger 82</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bound</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (16 vols)</td>
<td>Yes (13 vols)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Original Text Leaves</td>
<td>387 + 8 leaves all from the same copy</td>
<td>299 from different copies</td>
<td>210 from different copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Text Leaves</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaves Originally from the Same Copy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Complete Plays</td>
<td>31 (with no facsimile leaves)</td>
<td>25 (18 with no facsimile leaves)</td>
<td>21 (8 with no facsimile leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Condition of Text Leaves</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Very Good (with exceptions)</td>
<td>Very Good (with exceptions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Unimpaired</td>
<td>Virtually</td>
<td>For the most part</td>
<td>For the most part</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To relate column 1 to the seven tests referred to above, it will be noted that supplementary information is given concerning 'Number of original leaves' and 'Condition of leaves and text', and that three tests are omitted: 'Known location' because it is self-evident and non-differentiating among the three copies; 'Folger number' and 'Owner's decision' because these are points at issue. Appendix D 2 contains supplementary bibliographical information on the three copies, including what each contains.

There is one additional consideration—unique to these copies—which can be taken into account. It could be termed 'supporting legitimacy through comparison or association'. That Folger 80, 81 and 82 have more original leaves than the two accepted copies, 66 and 74, helps to legitimate them. That all three are 'better than' the

---

16 Hinman, (1, 7, n 1)
accepted copy 63, which 'is made up throughout from very miscellaneous, mostly
disjunct, leaves of various sizes', also helps to legitimate them. That the collection
contains unbound numbered copies (40, 57, 65 and 74) argues for not disqualifying 80;
and the fact that one Sutro copy (with a Lee number) in San Francisco is bound in
twelve volumes argues for not disqualifying 81 and 82.  

Unless one insists on a binding, Folger 80 is definitely a copy. Folger 81 is more
questionable and 82 even more so, but they are still superior to many accepted copies,
including copies in the Folger collection. The fact that 82 lacks so many leaves is
indeed a weakness in my argument, but the condition of the leaves and text is good.
Further, given the copy's close association with 81 as demonstrated in Appendix D 2, it
would indeed seem strange to accept 81 and reject 82. Like Blayney, I count all three
as copies.

17 Folger Cat RLIN.
18 The Sutro copy (Lee 146), which I have examined, has eleven complete plays and seven plays with
one to four leaves missing, plus four leaves of Timon of Athens.
Appendix D 1

Determining What to Count as a Copy

The considerations for determining copy-status are summarised in Table A. Columns 3 and 4 distinguish between necessary and sufficient conditions to be met in determining copy-status. The starting point for judging any volume is column 3, row 1 or row 2. Any copy with a Lee or Folger number is automatically counted, except the six untraced Lee copies (and any of these would be counted if they were found, i.e., if they met the fifth criterion), the two destroyed copies (Lee 157 and 158) and the Forrest Home copy. Further, any copy is counted if it has more than fifty percent of the original text leaves, so long as its location is known and the text is legible. Column 5 invites the consideration of three desiderata in determining copy-status. Meeting two of the tests is always desirable. Meeting the other test can strengthen the claim of a marginal copy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Considerations in Determining Copy-status</th>
<th>Sufficient if Met</th>
<th>Necessary to be Met</th>
<th>Desirable to be Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lee Number or Folger Number</td>
<td>Yes, except 9 Lee nos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%+ of Original Text Leaves</td>
<td>Yes, if 5 &amp; 6 are also met</td>
<td>Yes, with exceptions</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bound and Bound in One Volume</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Leaves Originally from the Same Copy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Location</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, except 14 copies</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of Leaves &amp; Text</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner’s Decision</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19 Namely, thirteen ‘Unfound’ copies and a copy in Japan of which I do not know the address.
Appendix D 2

SUPPLEMENTARY BIBLIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION
ON FOLGER 80, 81 AND 82

Folger 80: The twenty folders, made of thick board covered with burgundy wove cloth, are unnumbered, but each contains a loose slip numbering it 1 to 20. Six of the folders also contain a mailing label from Maggs Brothers of London addressed to ‘H. C. Folger Esq., 26 Broadway, New York.’ Each label is dated 28 December 1926. The leaves of each folder (except those in number 10) are sewn together. There are no preliminary leaves. The 387 original leaves are Fl-cc3, ee3-zz2. The eight leaves stored separately are from Cymbeline: zz4-3a5.


Indicative of the cleanness of the text, there are only two noteworthy marginalia. On the first page of King John (a1f), a date—‘Lady Day 1683’—and an illegible note appear, written in the same ink. On the first five leaves of Macbeth (Il6-mm4) there are a number of vertical pencil strokes, marking lines of the text but not touching them.

Folger 81 (Red) and 82 (Green) were made up together, partly from the same original copies. The sets are identically bound in morocco, the difference being that the best copy of each play or group is bound in red and the second best in green.20 The red bindings are rather more scuffed than the green. The volumes are unnumbered, but there is a loose slip in each giving its number in the set. Each volume is titled in the same style as the titles on the burgundy folders. All plays in the Green set are also in the Red set. In both sets missing leaves have been replaced by facsimile leaves. Each leaf of both sets is inlaid into margins of modern paper. In general, the leaves in both sets are in good condition, showing some repairs and a few missing corners but with the text for the most part unimpaired. (Peter Blayney informed me that among the Folio fragments at the Folger which I have not seen are two complete copies of The Winter’s Tale and some additional leaves which Folger apparently acquired separately from the

20 Peter Blayney describes the sets in his First Folio of Shakespeare, 46.
Burgundy, Red and Green sets but which appear to be associated with the same enterprise of making up copies. Some leaves are framed in exactly the same way, with the same dimension).

**Folger 81** contains 308 leaves, nine of which are in facsimile. In addition, one facsimile leaf duplicates a badly damaged original (S3 in volume 7), and one original leaf (oo3 in volume 15) appears twice. The original margins are small and manuscript marginalia are sometimes cropped.

The following list gives the volume numbers, the plays in each volume, the leaves in facsimile, and several other items of interest. 1. *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. 2. *Measure for Measure*. 3. *The Comedy of Errors*. 4. *Much Ado About Nothing*. 5. *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (N4 is in facsimile. O1f, column b, line 55 has 'the' underlined, and in the margin is a note in an early hand in ink: 'these/ S J'). 6. *The Merchant of Venice*. 7. *As You Like It* (Facsimiles: R1 and R6. Exceptionally, these leaves are not inlaid and are loose.); *The Taming of the Shrew* (The original S3, which is inlaid and loose, is very damaged. It is duplicated by a bound-in facsimile.); *All's Well That Ends Well*. 8. *King John*. 9. *Richard II* (d3v has the remarkable Favyn set-off.21); 1 *Henry IV* (with marginalia on f4v and f6f); 2 *Henry IV*. 10. *Richard III*. 11. *Troilus and Cressida* (with several manuscript notations on 'gg3', among them three early signatures: 'Edward Rich Esq.', 'Elizabeth Haben' or 'Baben', and 'Ralph Congreve'). 12. *Coriolanus*. 13. *Romeo and Juliet* (Facsimiles: ff5, gg1-2); *Titon of Athens* (Gg5, in facsimile, is loose, not inlaid; hh5, original, has beneath the ornament the signature: 'Giles Greenwood 1692'). 14. *Julius Caesar*. 15. *Macbeth*; *Hamlet* (Facsimile: nn6. Housed in this volume is a duplicate original of oo3 from the 'Nursery' Folio; oo6, bound in, is also from the 'Nursery' Folio22). 16. *King Lear*; *Othello* (Facsimile: tt6); *Antony and Cleopatra*.


---

21 Ibid. 7.
22 See Blayney, 34-35, where he speaks of discovering six 'Nursery' Folio leaves when he was preparing for the Folger 1991 First Folio Exhibition.
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ff3-4); Timon of Athens. 12. *Macbeth* (Facsimiles: mm1, mm4 and nn4); *Hamlet* (Facsimiles: nn6, oo5, pp3-4, pp6 and qq1). 13. *King Lear* (Facsimile: qq2); *Othello* (Facsimiles: vv3 and vv5); *Antony and Cleopatra* (Facsimiles: xx3-4, xx6, yy6 and zz1).

On file at the Folger is an envelope containing four letters and some manuscript notes concerning the purchase of the Green set. They illustrate the personal, detailed attention that Folger devoted to his Folio purchases, as well as his insistence on getting value for money. The first letter, dated 28 January 1920, is from Gabriel Wells, Importer and Dealer, 489 Fifth Avenue, New York City. Addressed to H C Folger, it offers *Macbeth/Hamlet* and *Troilus and Cressida*—"the two volumes for $500'. The second, dated the next day, is also from Wells. He offers 'the entire lot [including the two volumes offered the day before] as well as the loose pages for $1600'. The third, dated 30 January, is a copy of Folger's one-page typed reply to Wells (no signature or typed name). He notes that there are twenty-one plays but diminishes the value of the lot by drawing attention, for example, to the number of facsimile leaves. He concludes: 'I do not care for the so-called annotated volumes at $500. [But I will take the entire lot] at not over $1,250.00. I figure that a real liberal valuation, including the cost of the expensive binding, of the entire lot, should not be more than $100.00, but I am willing to make it $1,250.' Wells's response, dated 31 January, accepts the $1,250 offer.

There are three pages of pencilled notes, apparently in Folger's hand. *Inter alia,* they include a list of the plays which corresponds with those in the Green set. Against each play he notes the page number of facsimiles or the word 'good'. His reckoning differs considerably from mine. These notes also indicate that the 'loose pages' (referred to above by Wells) included sixteen leaves from the First Folio and three from the Second, the rest being facsimile leaves.

---

23 nn5, oo1-2 and oo4 are from the 'Nursery' copy (Blayney, ibid, 34-5). Blayney, 34, erroneously says *King Lear* is in the same volume as *Macbeth* and *Hamlet*.

24 In September 1992, these items were misfiled in volume 1 of the Red set.
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INTRODUCTION

This chapter addresses three questions about the First Folio: how many copies are extant? What is the present world-wide distribution of copies? How has the distribution changed since the beginning of the century?

Concerning the number of extant copies, the statements even of the experts have not been conclusive. As we saw in the previous chapter no one till now has defined a 'copy'. In 1963, Charlton Hinman guessed there were 'some 230-odd' copies extant. This was generally taken as authoritative until Paul Werstine stated in 1989 that 'the number of extant copies . . . need[s] to be resolved.' In 1991, Peter Blayney wrote: 'It is usually estimated that about 230 or 240 copies . . . survive.' By using the tests or considerations described in the previous chapter we can give a definite answer.

In this chapter I trace a path through thickets of details over the following ground. First, I summarise the number and distribution of copies in Sidney Lee's 1902 Census. This allows us to break down the distribution of copies in three ways—geographically, between public and private ownership, and according to condition. I then look at how many additional copies Lee discovered in his lifetime. Having as far as possible added these 'new' copies retrospectively to the 1902 figures, I analyse the distribution of the adjusted totals according to the same three-way breakdown. This forms a basis for comparison with the present. Finally, I give a precise figure for the number of extant copies today, show their present distribution, and draw conclusions about their movement since the beginning of the century.

A NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION OF COPIES IN THE 1902 CENSUS

The body of Lee's Census contains 158 numbered copies. He added two copies (numbers 78A and 134A) in a postscript in the Census. Two of the 158 (numbers 157 and 158) were 'stated to have been destroyed'. Thus in 1902 there was a net figure of 158. It is some measure of Lee's accomplishment that but five years before only a little over eighty-nine copies had been listed (see Chapter 4, Section A, end of second paragraph). Lee's 158 were distributed, by geography and public/private ownership, as shown in the last row of Table A below.

---

1 Hinman, 1, 39, n 3.
2 Paul Werstine, 'More Unrecorded States in the Folger Shakespeare Library's Collection of First Folios,' Library, 6/11 (1989), 49.
3 Blayney, 40.
4 In 1898, Lee had written: 'It seems that about 140 copies have been traced within the past century' (Lee, 1898, 311). This statement is not readily reconciled with what he says in the Census Introduction: 'I believe that I have noticed for the first time nearly a hundred hitherto unrecorded copies' (16). Whatever number Lee recorded for the first time, the world is indebted to him for the rich body of information he assembled on copies of the First Folio.
In addition to indicating location and public/private ownership, Lee assigned copies to classes according to condition. The following, transcribed without change from the headings in his *Census*, gives his definition of the classes:

**CLASS I** (Perfect Copies)

- **Division A** (in good, unrestored condition)
- **Division B** (in good condition, but with occasional leaves either supplied from another copy of the First Folio or repaired, i.e. mended, mounted, or inlaid)
- **Division C** (in good condition, with leaves occasionally supplied from later Folios)

**CLASS II** (Imperfect)

- **Division A** (in good condition, but with a few pages missing, and occasionally other slight defects)
- **Division B** (in fair condition, but with fly-leaf and occasionally other leaves missing, or supplied either from later Folios or in facsimile)
- **Division C** (in moderate condition, with most of preliminary and other missing leaves in Facsimile or from later Folios)

**CLASS III**

- **Division A** (defective; numerous leaves in various sections missing, or made up in Facsimile or from later Folios)
- **Division B** (Fragmentary)

**CLASS IV**

Copies otherwise unclassed owing to lack of full description
Copies stated to have been destroyed.

---

5 In Greg’s personal copy of the Introduction to the *Census*, he underlines ‘Class I’ and ‘with leaves occasionally supplied from later Folios’ and comments on the wording as follows: ‘(!!!!)’ (MS note in W W Greg’s copy of Lee, *Census*, in the Morris Library, Southern Illinois University). This prefigures his 1903 article in *The Library* in which as noted in Chapter 4 he objects to Lee’s classifications: ‘A copy in which [leaves are supplied from later folios] is emphatically not a perfect copy’ (‘The Bibliographical History of the First Folio’, *Library*, 2/15 (1903), 258-85, (267)).
The distribution of the copies by class (as well as by geography and public/private mix) in the 1902 Census is shown in Table A. In effect, this table, showing distribution in all three ways, is a summary of Lee’s Census:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rest of World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIIA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIIB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before analysing the 1902 distribution of copies, I amend Table A retrospectively, incorporating the changes and additional copies recorded later by Lee. This retrospective adjustment is to enhance accuracy, and it is worth doing because 1902 is the base year for purposes of comparison. The adjustment also follows the precedent set by Lee in his 1906 article. 1902 is an appropriate base year, because the turn of the century marked a change in the history of the Folio—a change which gave birth to a census and which was accelerated by the Census’s publication. Also, as we approach another fin de siècle, there is something intrinsically appealing about taking a roughly one-hundred-year look.

B NUMBER OF COPIES RECORDED BY LEE, 1902-1925

No sooner was Lee’s Census published than he began to learn of additional copies. In 1906 he published his ‘Notes and Additions to the Census’. Here he numbered and described fourteen newly discovered copies. This raised the total of recorded extant copies from 158 to 172.

---

6 Australia, Italy, Germany, New Zealand and South Africa.
In his 1923 address, 'in Celebration of the First Folio Tercentenary', he said: 'Since my [1902 and 1906] results were published, thirteen copies of which I did not know have come to light, so that we may estimate one hundred and eighty to survive'. Presumably his figure of 'one hundred and eighty' is due to rounding, since there is no evidence or even a hint that five copies had been destroyed. Accordingly, 172 plus thirteen gives a new total of 185.

Unfortunately, Lee did not describe these thirteen copies, nor did he number them. In fact, in the body of his text (as opposed to notes added later) he identified only two of the 'new' copies—viz: Bibliothèque Nationale and Villa Landau. However, in an afternote he has 'just' (19 June 1924) learned of the King's College, Cambridge, copy. This copy clearly was not among the thirteen he talked about in 1923. Then, in a footnote on page 102, he refers to a TLS announcement on 5 July 1923 of an unrecorded copy in Roorkee, India. The total to here, if the Indian copy is included, is 187.

Finally, in the 1925 edition of his Life, Lee mentions two copies, 'unnoticed' in the Census, that were sold in June 1925. Thus (excluding the two he listed as 'Destroyed' in 1902) Lee recorded 188 or, if the Roorkee copy is confirmed, 189 copies.

C RETROSPECTIVE DISTRIBUTION OF COPIES IN 1902
ACCORDING TO CONDITION

Turning now to an analysis of distribution, I deal first with the distribution of copies according to condition. I take 'condition' first in order to dispose of it, and thus simplify the presentation of the 'geographical' and 'public/private' analyses, which I carry up to the present time.

After 1906 there is very little information concerning the condition of copies with which to make valid generalisations. For this reason, and because I would not be able to inspect a sufficient number of copies, I decided not to repeat Lee's exercise of categorising copies according to their condition. In any case, the degree of subjectivity involved would yield results of little value to the bibliographical or literary scholar.

---

7 Lee, 1924, 81.
8 He additionally referred to a possible copy in Valladolid, Spain, but he presumably did not include this in his thirteen. (He started this section of his article by saying he could discover 'only four copies on the continent of Europe' [100], and these four are each named before the Spanish reference.)
9 The copy of Lord Middleton, Wollaton Hall, for £1,750, 'and a comparatively good copy, whose owner's name was undisclosed, for the substantial sum of £3,000' (Lee, 1925, x, n 2). The final edition of Lee's Life contains an appendix, 'concerned for the most part with work which has been done since the author's death' (vii), which posthumously mentioned five further copies, the Brotherton copy (West 12) and 'four other unrecorded copies [which] came to light in 1928'. Two of these were identified: one from Toft Hall, Knutsford, and one from the library of the late Mrs. John Rylands' (West 146)—Lee, 1931, 733.
10 However, I intend in due course to test the feasibility of organising a world-wide project to describe
Table C in Appendix D 1 distributes the copies Lee found after 1902 (and for which he gives us a class assignment) among his classes and adds them to the 1902 totals. It shows that over a quarter (28%) are in Lee’s ‘Perfect’ class; a half (49%) are in his Class II, of which the divisions are ‘good’, ‘fair’ or ‘moderate’. Given the rigours these volumes have endured—especially in their first two-and-a-half centuries—it is remarkable that more than three-quarters are in ‘moderate’ or better condition. We are additionally fortunate that as many as fourteen copies (8%) are in Class IA, defined as ‘in good, unrestored condition’. All fourteen are preserved in institutional libraries.\footnote{In the UK: British Library, Guildhall Library, National Library of Scotland, and Trinity College Cambridge (two copies); in the USA: Boston Public Library, Brown University, the Folger Shakespeare Library, Free Library of Philadelphia, Huntington Library, Princeton University, and Yale University; on the Continent: Bodmer Library and Cologne University.}

We should bear in mind that the classifying judgements were made about the copies as they were in the first years of the century. However, the fact that there is no current classification according to condition probably does not affect the conclusions very much. This is so for at least three, related reasons. First, as shown later, copies have progressively moved from private to public libraries, where they are more likely to receive professional protection and care. Second, consciousness and knowledge concerning the care (and the right kind of care) a book needs have greatly increased. The very publication of Lee’s census made owners more aware of what they possessed, and, in part because others knew what they had, increased their sense of responsibility for looking after their possession. Third, as we saw in Chapter 1, the pecuniary value of copies has increased enormously—one might say astronomically—since the turn of the century. One tends to conserve more carefully what one has bought dearly, and also perhaps what has sky-rocketed in value while one owned it. Thus, the condition of most copies is not likely to have changed very radically during the course of the century.

**D RETROSPECTIVE DISTRIBUTION OF COPIES IN 1902**

**ACCORDING TO GEOGRAPHY AND PUBLIC/PRIVATE MIX**

Table C in Appendix D 2 shows the retrospective distribution of copies in 1902—both geographical and public/private. In the UK there were 115 copies (66%), in the USA forty copies (23%), with 3% in the rest of the world (one each in Australia, France, Germany, Italy, South Africa and New Zealand) and 8% untraced. Of the UK copies there were seven in Scotland (Lee 1906, 29) and one in Ireland.
As for the public/private distribution of copies overall (leaving out the Untraced), forty-nine (31%) were in public institutions and 112 (69%) were privately held. In the UK the public/private mix of copies was 29/71 and in the USA 25/75.  

E NUMBER OF EXTANT COPIES TODAY AND THEIR DISTRIBUTION

In the first decades of this century the primary shift in distribution was geographical—from the UK to the USA. As we saw in Chapter 1, the migration was already well underway in the 1890s. Quaritch wrote to Lee c. 1899, ‘Perfect copies are usually sold by us dealers to American collectors. They thus get scarcer and dearer every year’. By 1923, according to Lee, in the UK there were thirty-one publicly owned copies and just over forty privately held copies, and in the USA there were twelve or thirteen publicly owned copies and just over eighty copies in private hands (Lee, 1924, 102-03). Thus in two decades, there was little shift in public ownership, whereas private ownership in the UK halved and in the USA increased nearly three times. Thereafter, the movement to the USA continued, to be joined by a shift from private to public ownership. Recently there has been a migration to Japan.

Lee had strong feelings about public ownership and the migration of copies to America. He firmly favoured public ownership:

"I make no complaint about private ownership, but in view of the indebtedness of English-speaking peoples to the First Folio, I think it can be argued that the more original copies of it that are accessible to the public, the better for the intelligent recognition of Shakespeare’s genius by the English people at large, the better for public sentiment and scholarship. (Lee, 1924, 105)"

He hoped that Folger ‘and other American collectors with a less colossal craving will in time make over most of their First Folios to public libraries in America’ (103). He strongly regretted, and accurately predicted, the further exodus across the Atlantic: ‘...I am in doubt whether any copy of the First Folio now in private hands has a solid chance of escaping an early voyage across the Atlantic’ (99). If English millionaires don’t ‘bestir themselves’, ‘there is a likelihood that all the forty privately owned copies of the volume still in this country will make tracks across the Atlantic’ (105). There was little bestirring.

The following table shows the distribution of copies today by country and as between public and private ownership:

---

12 Lee’s totals contain anomalies. Appendix D 3 illustrates the problem.
14 The use of the words ‘public’ and ‘private’ needs explanation. Lee’s terms were ‘Public Institutions’ and ‘Private Owners’, and he counted Lee 66 (Windsor Castle) and Lee 37 (Pierpont Morgan Library) as private. I count Lee 66 and Lee 37, as well as Lee 8 (now in the Bodmer) as public. I count Lee 7, 71 and 136, which are housed in institutions but privately owned, as private.
### TABLE E

Distribution of Copies Today: Geographical and Public/Private

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of Copies</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of Copies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNITED KINGDOM AND IRELAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>UNITED STATES AND CANADA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Public 37</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>Public 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Private 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Public 1</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Public 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REST OF THE WORLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Private 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Public 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Public 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Public 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Public 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Public 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Public 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>UNFOUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In Lee, Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untraced</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>Foley copy 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destroyed</td>
<td>In Lee, Census 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire-damaged</td>
<td>Forrest Home copy (Lee 145) 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we include the following:

- All copies with a Lee or a Folger number (with the exceptions noted)
- All copies with more than fifty percent of the text leaves (with the exceptions noted), so long as their location is known and their condition is good enough (as far as we know)
- The thirteen Unfound copies, the copy known to exist in Japan but with unknown address, and Folger 80, 81 and 82

The Roorkee volume and the Tomsk 'copy', referred to in the Introduction to Chapter 7, are not included in the table.

---

15 Designated 'Europe' according to the owner's wishes.
then . . . but it is not as simple as that. In addition, we also have to remember the following:

- One or more of the Untraced copies or the Foley copy may turn up, and one or more of the Unfound copies may not turn up
- One or more of the copies currently categorised as 'Non-Lee' or 'Non-Lee?' may in fact turn out to have a Lee number
- Additional unrecorded copies may come to light. This does not seem very likely in certain countries (Australia, Canada, China, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, and countries in Africa, for example), but it is perfectly possible that 'new' copies will turn up in the UK, in the USA, and on the Continent, including Eastern Europe, and in Russia. It is more likely that any unrecorded copy will be in private, rather than in institutional, hands.

If we take all of the foregoing into account, we can say that there are 228 extant copies today, and others may turn up. This is almost one third of the number printed if Blayney’s ‘guess of 750’ is correct. I have personally confirmed the existence of 215 of these--ie, all copies I admit to the Census except the Unfound copies--and I have confirmed the location of 214 copies. Of these I have seen fifty-six since August 1989, mostly at their present locations. For the remaining 158 I have a letter or other document from the owner or keeper or a reliable third party.

Finally, Table F below compares the current distribution with that in 1902, to show how copies have moved during the twentieth century. It should be noted that the 1997 figures are net after various cross-trafficking. For example, the Turbutt copy (Lee, 1906, copy 5) returned from private to public ownership (the Bodleian) in 1906. Lee 31/West 22 returned to the UK from the USA in 1935; it was in Cambridge, Massachusetts in 1902, and in Senate House Library in 1998. Lee 84/West 43 returned to England after its sale in New York in 1981. The source of several of the Japanese copies was the United States.

---

16 See Chapter 5, Section B.
17 Norton Facsimile, 1996, xxxiii. The question of how many copies were printed is covered in a footnote to Section A in Chapter 1.
Table F
The Movement of Copies 1902 to 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1902 (Retrospective)</th>
<th>1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK &amp; Ireland</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA &amp; Canada</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of the World</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untraced Unfound(^18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The major changes between 1902 and 1998 can be summarised as follows:

- An additional seventy copies (including the seventeen added to the 1902 totals in Appendix D 2) have been recorded since the Lee Census.
- A decrease occurred in the UK and Ireland of seventy-one copies, from 66% of the world total to 19%. Three copies remain in Scotland and one in Ireland.
- A remarkable increase of 106 copies occurred in the USA and Canada, from 23% to 64% of the total. Canada's gain was from zero to one copy.
- Most of the increase in the Rest of the World was in Japan (not shown separately in the table) from zero to fifteen copies (all since 1969).\(^19\) The only other 'new' country to have a Folio was Switzerland (and possibly India). Germany gained two copies.

---
\(^18\) 'Untraced' is Lee's word in 1902; this had the same meaning then as my meaning of the word 'Unfound' in 1998. The copies still 'untraced' today as indicated in the text are not included in the total today.

\(^19\) Owen Gingerich, writing c. 1978 about Copernicus's *De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium* (1543), observed that 'three of the last ten copies to enter the market have gone to universities in Japan' ('The Great Copernicus Chase' in his *The Great Copernicus Chase and Other Adventures in Astronomical History* (Cambridge, MA, 1992), 69-81 (72) (first published in *American Scholar*, 49 (1979) 81-88).
• A major shift occurred from a Public/Private mix of 31/69 to a mix of 94/6, with the Folger copies of course accounting for a large part of this shift. There are now only fourteen known copies privately held.

Having addressed the three questions advanced, I conclude with several observations on the body of First Folios today. A surprisingly large number has survived the vicissitudes of three and three-quarter centuries. A remarkable proportion of the survivors is in good condition. Almost all are housed in institutional libraries, and therefore have a good chance of being well looked-after. The USA now holds well over three times as many copies as the country of origin, and a notable number has recently migrated to Japan.
Appendix D 1

Retrospective Distribution of Copies in 1902
According to Condition

In his 1906 article, Lee assigned his fourteen 'new' copies as follows: Class I: four copies; Class II: five copies; and Class III: five copies. In addition, he promoted his 1902 copy 53 from Class IIA to Class I. In his 1924 'Survey' (105, n 1), he assigned the 'new' King's College, Cambridge, copy to Class IIB or C. If we add and subtract these figures—as appropriate—to the respective Class totals in the right-hand column of Table A, we arrive at the distribution shown in Table B. (This table totals 173 copies: 158 from Table A; fourteen from Lee, 1906; and the King's copy from Lee, 1924.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
<th>Defective/Fragmentary</th>
<th>Unclassed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copies</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

20 Lee explicitly assigns only the first two copies to Class I (or more precisely, IB), but one can infer from his note before the fifth copy ('The next five belong to the second class'—20) that the third and fourth must also belong to Class I.

21 Also, with more information on Lee 117, he promoted it from Class IIC to Class IIB, but this does not affect the class distribution (6). And he states he overvalued Lee 37 in 1902, but does not assign it to a lower class (6-7).
Appendix D 2

Retrospective Distribution of Copies in 1902:
Geographical and Public/Private

The point of departure for distributing the seventeen copies Lee found after 1902 is the totals in the 1902 Census—the figures in the bottom row in Table A (excluding Untraced copies). These totals are repeated in row 1 of Table C below. Lee’s clear distribution of the fourteen 1906 ‘new’ copies is shown in row 2. Row 3 adds the only two copies (Bibliothèque Nationale and King’s, Cambridge) mentioned in Lee, 1924, of whose 1902 owner we can at present be quite sure. Row 4 adds the one copy (Lord Middleton) sold in 1925 whose owner we know (Lee, 1931, 733). (Row 10 distributes the fourteen 1902 ‘Untraced’ copies between the UK and the USA according to Lee’s conjectures in the footnote to page 16 of his Introduction to the Census.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1902 Totals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1906 ‘New’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1924 ‘New’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1925 ‘New’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Rest of World</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 The total of this table (175—not shown), plus thirteen (namely eleven unidentified plus the Villa Landau copy and the presumed Indian copy) which are mentioned in Lee, 1924, but which are not included here, plus the one unidentified copy mentioned in Lee, 1931, but not included here, accords with the total Lee recorded (189).
Appendix D 3

Lee's Inconsistent Totals

Without a specific purpose or a fascination for confusion, the reader is advised to skip this appendix: it shows the difficulty of reckoning numbers despite their apparent clarity, and it also demonstrates Lee's imprecision.

Rows 1 and 2 should be the same:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>For the Year</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Lee, 1906, 29</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lee, 1924, 102</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar inconsistencies occur in his totals for public and private ownership. For example, on page 100 of Lee, 1924, he reckons 'there are at the moment thirty copies safe in public ownership [in the UK]'; whereas on page 102, he says: 'Recently the number of publicly owned copies in this country has increased to thirty-one'. The word 'increased' is additionally confusing, for there were thirty-one in the 1902 Census.

Other anomalies concern his class totals. In Lee 1924, page 82, he says he 'suffered only fourteen [copies in the Census] to enter' class IA. (Correct.) 'I placed twenty-nine in' class IB. (In fact, he placed twenty-seven, but he may well be including the two copies he promoted in 1906.) 'My largest class was the Second, in which I placed no fewer than sixty eight copies.' (In fact he placed eighty copies in 1902 in class II, or eighty-five if one includes the additional 1906 copies.) He also refers here to 'My Third and last Class', whereas in fact he had four classes (though the fourth 'class' was of 'otherwise unclassed' copies).
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INTRODUCTION

The last census of the First Folio, Sidney Lee's, appeared in 1902. Since then, many copies have changed ownership, many have migrated, and many additional copies have come to light.

This new census is intended primarily as an aid for scholars. It was prompted by Paul Werstine's article in *The Library* in 1989.¹ Making a case for continuing Charlton Hinman's pursuit of Folio press-variants, he says 'the number of extant copies and their location need to be resolved by an up-to-date census' (49). Many others since—from editors and bibliographers to rare book specialists and librarians—have expressed a wish for a new census. If further justification were required, one need not leave the field of variant analysis. Wells and Taylor in *A Textual Companion* comment that 'the text of an early edition can only be properly established by collating every extant copy of that edition, noting the variants between them'.² They regret not having done a

---


variant check for the new Oxford edition of Shakespeare, calling it 'a fault, and one which we hope will be remedied by other scholars' (61). They estimate that less than a quarter of the surviving copies have been checked.3 Obviously, if the whereabouts of many of them are unknown, they never can be.

If Terry Belanger's prediction proves correct, there may be another good reason for a new census at this time. He says that institutions will have such a need to save cost--everything from the housing, insurance and preservation cost of books and associated staffing cost--that in the next fifty years I predict that we are going to see the wholesale transfer of old books out of academic libraries at a scale that we have not seen since the decades following the French Revolution'.4 If such a diaspora were to involve the First Folio, at least a future census-maker can start with as firm a location for 215 copies as of 1994 as I had for 87 156 as of 1902.

As mentioned in Chapter 4, Section B, the research for the new census included the preparation and publication of two articles. The first, in The Book Collector in 1994, described and sought help in finding twenty-two missing copies. This number is now reduced to twenty. The second, in The Library in 1995, presented a provisional census and sought confirmation of its accuracy. In fact, the only change to the listing since then has been to take account of the new ownership of copies 174 and 175.5

A SCOPE OF THE CENSUS

The Census lists all known copies of the 1623 First Folio with the exceptions identified below. Thus it includes, or accounts for, all the copies in Lee's 1902 Census and in Lee, 1906, his 'Notes & Additions'. It incorporates all additional copies which have come to light since, and which have been located, including the copies Lee himself mentioned in his 1923 lecture (Lee, 1924).

Copies gain admittance to or are excluded from the Census according to the tests or considerations described in Chapter 5, Section A and summarised in Chapter 5, Appendix D 1. In summary, the following are included: Folger 80, 81 and 82 (these are treated in Chapter 5, Section B); Lee 141/West 18, Folger 40, 57, 65 66, and 74 (despite their condition); Lee 63, 88, 91, 99, 108, 115, 120, 125, 133, 135, 144, 148, and +13 (despite being 'Unfound'); West 212 (despite its address being unknown); and Lee 141/West 18 and Lee 146/West 51 (despite not being in one binding). Copies

---

3 Though 'most . . . of the substantive quartos have been collated at least once' (Wells and Taylor, 47).
5 Also, I have been able to remove the '?' from one of the doubtful Lee identifications--see Chapter 4, Dealing with Doubtful Identifications, Lee 41 and New York Public Library 6. I should like to acknowledge the many helpful suggestions made to me by Peter Blayney when he refereed the manuscript of my article for The Library.
formerly on loan to the University of St Andrews and the University of British Columbia were returned to the Folger Library in 1987 (Folger 9 and 14). The following untraced copies, excluded from the count of copies in Chapter 5, are listed in Part V of the Census, but without new numbers: Lee 54, 104, 122, 139, 153 and 156—see Chapter 5, Section A, items (1) and (5); a copy not recorded by Lee which is lost (the Foley copy) is listed at the end of Part V.

The following are excluded: Lee 157 and 158 (destroyed); Lee 145 (only 'ashes' and 'charred pages'); and the volume in Roorkee, India (not proven not to be a facsimile). Two other 'copies'—Valladolid and Tomsk—are excluded because I have not found them. I deal with Lee 145, the Valladolid copy and the Roorkee copy in Chapter 4, Section B, under 'Trails of Elusive Copies'. All I know about the Tomsk 'copy' is the following:

A copy of the First Folio was recently brought to light in Tomsk, Siberia, according to the director of a British book exhibition in Moscow. The story circulated by the Associated Press is to the effect that a Russian merchant brought the volume in the eighteenth century. The present location of the Folio is not stated.6

B ORGANISATION OF THE CENSUS

The Census is organised according to six principles. The first principle is geographical. This contrasts with Lee whose first principle of organisation was the condition of copies. I made the judgement that the degree of subjectivity required in such categorisation would yield results of limited value to the bibliographical or literary scholar (much as they might be relished or deplored by the owner). Lee's judgements are preserved, however, in the sub-headings of the cross-reference table in Section D below. I divide the Folio world into three parts:

I. United Kingdom and Ireland
II. United States of America and Canada
III. Rest of the World.

In the third part the entries are arranged by country in alphabetical order. In the UK and in countries in the Rest of the World the entries are arranged by city or town in alphabetical order. In the USA, cities/towns are arranged by state--each in alphabetical order. (Washington, DC, is listed under 'District of Columbia'.) For the present distribution of copies see Chapter 6, Section E and Table E.

The second principle is to distinguish institutional from private copies. Lee had separate sub-sections for these, but there now remain so few privately held copies (six in the UK, one in Europe, six in the USA, and one in Japan) that separate sub-sections

6 Quoted in full from 'First Folio in Siberia', SQ, 7 (1956), 460.
are not justified. Accordingly, they are listed geographically and identified by an asterisk (*) following the copy number. The third principle is to respect the privacy or security wishes of private owners. When a private owner wishes to remain anonymous, the copy is listed at the end of the appropriate geographical section. When a private owner wishes to give no address, the copy is listed under the most local geographical entity (e.g., Europe) to which he or she agrees.

The fourth principle is that if the owner and location are different (which is rare), location takes precedence. Thus the RSC Theatre's copy (number 39) is shown as at the Shakespeare Centre, Stratford-upon-Avon. The fifth principle is that if an owner has more than one copy, the copies are listed either in the sequence established by the owner (e.g., Folger) or in Lee's order. Otherwise, a common-sense order is used. The sixth principle is to highlight Unfound, Untraced and Lost copies, and thus increase the possibility of their being discovered. Part IV contains copies in Lee, Census and Lee, 1906, which have at present not been found, listed in the order of Lee numbers and date of Lee's publications. Part V contains six copies labelled in Lee's Census as 'Untraced', and which are still untraced, listed in the order of Lee numbers, and concludes with one copy not recorded by Lee which surfaced and disappeared.

C CONTENT OF THE ENTRIES IN THE CENSUS

For Parts I-III, the first item in each entry assigns a new reference number to each copy in a single through-numbering sequence. No number is assigned to copies Lee listed as 'Untraced' and which are still untraced, or to the lost non-Lee copy, or to destroyed copies. Copies which had a known owner/location in Lee, which have not been found since--the 'Unfound' copies--are given a new number in the hope that they will turn up.

The second item (in parentheses) gives Lee's Census number. For ease of reading I have changed his roman numerals to arabic. If the volume is one of the fourteen copies described in Lee's 1906 article, its number, given there by Lee, is preceded by a '■' sign (e.g., 'Lee1'). If it is one of the copies Lee first referred to in his 1924 article.

7 For the numbering of copies, my intent was to have as simple a system and as stable a sequence as possible. This led to the use of a provisional system in my Library article, so as not to pre-empt simple through-numbering. At the time I was expecting many changes in sequence, caused by sales, the discovery of 'new' copies, finding the location of lost copies and identifying Lee copies mislabelled 'Non-Lee'. With its distinctive nation designator and quite different numbers for most copies, the provisional numbers would hopefully not cause confusion when replaced with through-numbers.

When a copy moves in the future, it can retain its present through-number, even though with a change of location the number would not be in sequence with the numbers of its geographic neighbours; the nation designator of the provisional system would have caused problems when copies changed countries. When a new number is needed in the future, it can be the number of the previous copy in the Census (determined by the location of the copy requiring a number) with the addition of an alphabetic suffix; this is the system Lee used for two copies requiring an identifier after his numbers were set. Because of the obvious risk of confusion, I hesitated long before deciding to put two sets of numbers out into the world. For better or for worse, on balance, it seemed the less bad solution. At least, through-numbering, with only one designator, avoids complications and, with sales having slowed down, perhaps not many copies will change location.
it is labelled 'Lee, 1924' (followed by the page reference). If a copy is believed not to be mentioned by Lee, it is labelled 'Non-Lee'. If it is not known whether a copy is or is not one of those mentioned by Lee, it is labelled 'Non-Lee?'. A cautionary word should be entered here. It has not been possible categorically to confirm that each copy labelled 'Non-Lee' is in fact not one of those he mentions. Thus, among the copies labelled 'Non-Lee' may be hiding some of the 'Unfound' and 'Untraced' copies.

The third item gives the present owner or keeper. The owner/keeper's name for second and subsequent copies is represented by a dash (—). The fourth item gives the authority by which the owner/keeper and location are confirmed:

‘sseen’ = I have seen the copy, usually at the location shown in the Census, since August 1989

‘a date’ = I have a letter or other document of that date from the owner or keeper, or a reliable third party.

To help identify the unlocated volumes, Parts IV and V contain detailed information on each copy. The precise content of the entries is described after the heading for each Part.

D CONCORDANCE OF LEE NUMBERS AND WEST NUMBERS

The left-hand figure in the columns below is the Lee Census number. Following number 156 are the fourteen numbered copies in his 1906 Library article. These fourteen copies are preceded by a ‘+’ sign. The right-hand figure is the copy's new reference number. Lee's assignment of copies to Classes and Divisions is indicated in the sub-headings.
Class I

Division A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lee</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 =</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 =</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 =</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 =</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 =</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 =</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 =</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 =</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 =</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Division B

| 10 = | 179 |
| 11 = | 149 |
| 12 = | 183 |
| 13 = | 52  |
| 14 = | 156 |

Class II

Division A

| 15 = | 24  |
| 16 = | 21  |
| 17 = | 37  |
| 18 = | 68  |
| 19 = | 70  |
| 20 = | 67  |
| 21 = | 53  |
| 22 = | 205 |
| 23 = | 196 |
| 24 = | 150 |
| 25 = | 14  |
| 26 = | 126 |
| 27 = | 129 |
| 28 = | 164 |
| 29 = | 166 |
| 30 = | 163 |
| 31 = | 22  |
| 32 = | 54  |
| 33 = | 78  |
| 34 = | 153 |

Division B

| 35 = | 64  |
| 36 = | 65  |
| 37 = | 170 |
| 38 = | 198 |
| 39 = | 181 |
| 40 = | 75? |
| 41 = | 169 |
| 5 =  | 13  |
| 6 =  | 195 |
| 7 =  | 8   |
| 8 =  | 215 |
| 9 =  | 57  |

Class I

| 10 = | 179 |
| 11 = | 149 |
| 12 = | 183 |
| 13 = | 52  |
| 14 = | 156 |

Division B

| 15 = | 24  |
| 16 = | 21  |
| 17 = | 37  |
| 18 = | 68  |
| 19 = | 70  |
| 20 = | 67  |
| 21 = | 53  |
| 22 = | 205 |
| 23 = | 196 |
| 24 = | 150 |
| 25 = | 14  |
| 26 = | 126 |
| 27 = | 129 |
| 28 = | 164 |
| 29 = | 166 |
| 30 = | 163 |
| 31 = | 22  |
| 32 = | 54  |
| 33 = | 78  |
| 34 = | 153 |

Division C

| 35 = | 64  |
| 36 = | 65  |
| 37 = | 170 |
| 38 = | 198 |
| 39 = | 181 |
| 40 = | 75? |
| 41 = | 169 |
| 78A = | 74 |

Class II

Division A

| 10 = | 179 |
| 11 = | 149 |
| 12 = | 183 |
| 13 = | 52  |
| 14 = | 156 |

Division B

<p>| 15 = | 24  |
| 16 = | 21  |
| 17 = | 37  |
| 18 = | 68  |
| 19 = | 70  |
| 20 = | 67  |
| 21 = | 53  |
| 22 = | 205 |
| 23 = | 196 |
| 24 = | 150 |
| 25 = | 14  |
| 26 = | 126 |
| 27 = | 129 |
| 28 = | 164 |
| 29 = | 166 |
| 30 = | 163 |
| 31 = | 22  |
| 32 = | 54  |
| 33 = | 78  |
| 34 = | 153 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class II</th>
<th>Class III</th>
<th>Lee, 1906</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division C</td>
<td>Division B</td>
<td>+1 = 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106 = 26</td>
<td>141 = 18</td>
<td>+2 = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 = 39</td>
<td>142 = 20</td>
<td>+3 = 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108 = 220</td>
<td>143 = 38</td>
<td>+4 = 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109 = 81</td>
<td>144 = 226</td>
<td>+5 = 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 = 134</td>
<td>145 = Fragment$^8$</td>
<td>+6 = 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 = 184</td>
<td>146 = 51</td>
<td>+7 = 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 = 40</td>
<td></td>
<td>+8 = 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 = 211</td>
<td>147 = 192</td>
<td>+9 = 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114 = 113</td>
<td>148 = 175</td>
<td>+10 = 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 = 221</td>
<td>149 = 214</td>
<td>+11 = 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116 = 168</td>
<td>150 = 213</td>
<td>+12 = 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117 = 177</td>
<td>151 = 71</td>
<td>+13 = 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 = 151</td>
<td>152 = 171</td>
<td>+14 = 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 = 100</td>
<td>153 = Untraced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 = 222</td>
<td>154 = 79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 = 101</td>
<td>155 = 63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122 = Untraced</td>
<td>156 = Untraced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Class III**

| Division A | |
| 123 = 116 | |
| 124 = 80 | |
| 125 = 223 | |
| 126 = 89 | |
| 127 = 129 | |
| 128 = 172 | |
| 129 = 104 | |
| 130 = 210 | |
| 131 = 135 | |
| 132 = 102 | |
| 133 = 224 | |
| 134 = 174 | |
| 134A = 186 | |
| 135 = 225 | |
| 136 = 158 | |
| 137 = 45 | |
| 138 = 50 | |
| 139 = Untraced | |
| 140 = 93 | |

---

$^8$ The Forrest Home copy. For its exclusion from the Census, see Chapter 5, Section A, (2) 'Number of Original Leaves'.

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARUNDEL, SUSSEX</td>
<td>1* (Lee+2) The Duke of Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arundel Castle (Apr 90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLASGOW</td>
<td>11 (62) Glasgow University Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11 Apr 90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRMINGHAM</td>
<td>2 (58) Birmingham Shakespeare Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 June 93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEEDS</td>
<td>12 (Non-Lee) Brotherton Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leeds University Library (24 Apr 90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMBRIDGE</td>
<td>3 (Lee 1924, 105) King’s College Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19 Apr 94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (3) Trinity College Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(28 Feb 94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 (4) -- (28 Feb 94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 (59) Cambridge University Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(28 Feb 94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURHAM</td>
<td>7 (47) University Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Durham (seen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONDON</td>
<td>13 (1) British Library (seen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 (25) -- (seen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 (44) -- (seen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 (45) -- (seen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 (55) -- (seen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 (141) Dulwich College Library (seen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 (2) Guildhall Library (16 Mar 94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 (142) Reform Club (seen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 (16) Sir John Soane’s Museum (seen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 (31) Senate House Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of London (seen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 (81) -- (seen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 (15) National Art Library, Victoria and Albert Museum (24 Mar 94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDINBURGH</td>
<td>8* (7) Private collection. On deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with the National Library of Scotland (27 Nov 91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 (Lee+10) National Library of Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4 May 90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 (56) -- (24 Mar 94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 (106) -- (24 Mar 94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 (57) Dr Williams’s Library (seen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28* (83) Private Owner (14 Nov 91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETON</td>
<td>10 (61) Eton College Library (Apr 90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Privately owned

9 Though noted posthumously in Lee, 1931, 733.
LONGLEAT HOUSE, WILTSHIRE
29* (50) Marquess of Bath (Mar 90)

TYSOE, WARWICKSHIRE
40* (112) The Marquess of Northampton
Compton Wyndates (9 Dec 91)

MANCHESTER
30 (48) John Rylands University Library
University of Manchester (27 May 93)

WINCHESTER
41 (Non-Lee) Winchester College (seen)

OXFORD
31 (Lee+5) Bodleian Library (21 Dec 93)
32 (42) -- (21 Dec 93)
33 (49) Oriel College (seen)
34 (64) Queen’s College (seen)
35 (65) Wadham College (seen)

WINDSOR
42 (66) The Royal Library
Windsor Castle (27 Mar 90)

ENGLAND
43* (84) Private Library (2 Apr 93)

STONYHURST, LANCASHIRE
36 (46) Stonyhurst College (20 May 93)

PART I B: REPUBLIC OF IRELAND

DUBLIN
44 (60) Trinity College Library
University of Dublin (seen)

PART II: UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and CANADA

PART II A:
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

LOS ANGELES
47 (73) Charles Von der Ahe Library
Loyola Marymount University
(8 June 93)

CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY
45 (137) Bancroft Library University
of California (23 June 93)

48 (Lee+6) William Andrews Clark
Memorial Library, University of
California (10 Mar 94)

IRVINE
46 (Non-Lee) University Library
University of California (8 Mar 94)

OAKLAND
49 (Non-Lee) F W Olin Library
Mills College (15 June 93)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Library Description</th>
<th>Folger Copy</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO</td>
<td>50 (138)</td>
<td>Sutro Library (seen)</td>
<td>69 (Non-Lee)</td>
<td>Folger 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 (146)</td>
<td>(seen)</td>
<td>70 (19)</td>
<td>Folger 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71 (151)</td>
<td>Folger 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72 (92)</td>
<td>Folger 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52 (13)</td>
<td>Huntington Library (Seen)</td>
<td>73 (97)</td>
<td>Folger 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53 (21)</td>
<td>(Seen)</td>
<td>74 (78A)</td>
<td>Folger 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54 (32)</td>
<td>(Seen)</td>
<td>75 (40? 12)</td>
<td>Folger 18 (seen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 (51)</td>
<td>(Seen)</td>
<td>76 (90)</td>
<td>Folger 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77 (Lee+7)</td>
<td>Folger 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78 (Non-Lee)</td>
<td>Folger 21 13 (seen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79 (154)</td>
<td>Folger 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56 (105)</td>
<td>Wesleyan University Library (27 May 93)</td>
<td>80 (124)</td>
<td>Folger 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81 (109)</td>
<td>Folger 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82 (69)</td>
<td>Folger 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83 (70)</td>
<td>Folger 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84 (76)</td>
<td>Folger 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85 (Non-Lee)</td>
<td>Folger 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86 (Non-Lee)</td>
<td>Folger 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87 (Non-Lee)</td>
<td>Folger 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57 (9)</td>
<td>Elizabethan Club</td>
<td>88 (Lee+9)</td>
<td>Folger 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Yale University (9 June 93)</td>
<td>89 (126)</td>
<td>Folger 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90 (86)</td>
<td>Folger 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91 (80)</td>
<td>Folger 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92 (Lee+12)</td>
<td>Folger 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93 (140)</td>
<td>Folger 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58 (87)</td>
<td>Folger 1 (seen)</td>
<td>94 (Non-Lee)</td>
<td>Folger 37 (seen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59 (Non-Lee)</td>
<td>Folger 2 (seen)</td>
<td>95 (Non-Lee)</td>
<td>Folger 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 (Non-Lee)</td>
<td>Folger 3</td>
<td>96 (89)</td>
<td>Folger 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61 (Non-Lee)</td>
<td>Folger 4</td>
<td>97 (Non-Lee)</td>
<td>Folger 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62 (5)</td>
<td>Folger 5</td>
<td>98 (Non-Lee)</td>
<td>Folger 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63 (155)</td>
<td>Folger 6</td>
<td>99 (Non-Lee)</td>
<td>Folger 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64 (35)</td>
<td>Folger 7 (seen)</td>
<td>100 (119)</td>
<td>Folger 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65 (36)</td>
<td>Folger 8</td>
<td>101 (121)</td>
<td>Folger 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66 (Lee+3)</td>
<td>Folger 9</td>
<td>102 (132)</td>
<td>Folger 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67 (20)</td>
<td>Folger 10</td>
<td>103 (Non-Lee)</td>
<td>Folger 46 (seen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104 (129)</td>
<td>Folger 47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

10 For the identification of this volume, see Chapter 4, Section B, 'Following the Trails of Elusive Copies'.
11 The Folger copy number is given as the third item. Folger 1-79 are confirmed by Folger Cat RLIN. For Folger 80-82, see Chapter 5, Section B and Appendix D 2.
12 For this doubtful identification, see Chapter 4, Section C and Table C.
13 For a possible identification of this volume, see Chapter 4, Section C and Table F.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>(Non-Lee) Folger 48</td>
<td>140 (93) Georgetown University Library (30 June 93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>(Non-Lee) Folger 49</td>
<td>141 (Lee+14) Library of Congress (27 June 93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>(Non-Lee) Folger 50</td>
<td>142 (27) -- (27 June 93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>(Non-Lee) Folger 51</td>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>(78) Folger 52</td>
<td>CHICAGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>(Non-Lee) Folger 53 (seen)</td>
<td>143 (Non-Lee) Newberry Library (July 93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>(79) Folger 54</td>
<td>144* (75) Abel E Berland (17 Aug 92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>(Non-Lee) Folger 55</td>
<td>URBANA-CHAMPAIGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>(114) Folger 56</td>
<td>145 (Non-Lee) Rare Book and Special Collections Library University of Illinois (28 May 93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>(Non-Lee) Folger 57</td>
<td>INDIANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Non-Lee) Folger 58</td>
<td>BLOOMINGTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>(123) Folger 59 (seen)</td>
<td>146 (Non-Lee) Lilly Library Indiana University (20 Oct 93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>(Lee+8) Folger 60 (seen)</td>
<td>MARYLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>(72) Folger 61</td>
<td>BALTIMORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>(Non-Lee) Folger 62</td>
<td>147 (95) John Work Garrett Library Johns Hopkins University (2 June 93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>(Non-Lee) Folger 63</td>
<td>148 (Non-Lee?) The Walters Art Gallery (18 Apr 94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>(Non-Lee) Folger 64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>(Non-Lee) Folger 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>(Non-Lee) Folger 66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>(77) Folger 67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>(Non-Lee) Folger 68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>(26) Folger 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>(Non-Lee) Folger 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>(Non-Lee) Folger 71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>(127) Folger 72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>(Non-Lee) Folger 73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>(Non-Lee) Folger 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>(Lee+1) Folger 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>(Non-Lee) Folger 76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>(110) Folger 77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>(131) Folger 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>(Non-Lee) Folger 79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>(Non-Lee) Folger 80 (seen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>(Non-Lee) Folger 81 (seen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>(Non-Lee) Folger 82 (seen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

14 For the identification of this volume, see Chapter 4, Section B, 'Following the Trails of Elusive Copies'.

15 Though noted posthumously in Lee, 1931, 733.

16 For details on this volume, see Chapter 4, Appendix S 6, Table I.
MASSACHUSETTS

BOSTON
149 (11) Boston Public Library (seen)

CAMBRIDGE
150 (24) Widener Library
Harvard University (seen)
151 (118) Houghton Library
Harvard University (seen)

WALTHAM
152 (Non-Lee) Brandeis University Library (1 June 93)

WILLIAMSTOWN
153 (34) Chapin Library
Williams College (12 Aug 93)

NEBRASKA

LINCOLN
154 (Non-Lee)
The University Libraries
University of Nebraska (8 May 91)

NEW HAMPSHIRE

HANOVER
155 (Non-Lee) Hickmott Shakespeare Collection, Dartmouth College Library (30 Apr 91)

NEW YORK

BUFFALO
159 (Non-Lee) Buffalo and Erie County Public Library (1 June 93)
160 (Non-Lee) University Libraries State University of New York at Buffalo (1 Apr 94)

HAMILTON
161 (Non-Lee?) Case Library
Colgate University (27 May 93)

ITHACA
162 (Non-Lee) Carl A Kroch Library
Cornell University (29 June 94)

NEW YORK CITY
163 (30) Butler Library
Columbia University (1 June 93)
164 (28) New York Public Library
(21 Feb 94)
165 (Non-Lee) -- (21 Feb 94)
166 (29) -- (21 Feb 94)
167 (43) -- (21 Feb 94)
168 (116) -- (21 Feb 94)
169 (41) -- (21 Feb 94)
170 (37) Pierpont Morgan Library
PML 5122 (21 July 93)
171 (152) -- PML 5123 (21 July 93)

NEW JERSEY

PRINCETON
156 (14) Princeton University Libraries (17 Feb 93)

17 For details on this volume, see Chapter 4, Appendix S 6, Table J.
18 For the Lee identification, see Chapter 4, Section C and Table D.
19 The PML numbers are included at the Library's request.
172* (128) John Wolfson (22 June 93)

OHIO

OXFORD

173 (82) Walter Havighurst Special Collections, Miami University Libraries (4 June 93)

SPRINGBORO

174* (134) Stuart Rose (seen)21
175* (148) -- (Jul 1995)

PENNSYLVANIA

BETHLEHEM

176 (Non-Lee) Lehigh University Libraries (May 93)

BRYN MAWR

177 (117) Bryn Mawr College Library
(25 Apr 94)

HAVERTOWN

178 (33) James P Magill Library
Haverford College (26 May 93)

PHILADELPHIA

179 (10) Free Library of Philadelphia
(6 July 93)
180 (94) Horace Furness Memorial Library, Van Pelt-Dietrich Library
University of Pennsylvania
(8 June 93)

PITTSBURGH

181 (39) University Libraries
Carnegie Mellon University
(27 Sep 94)

WEST CHESTER

182 (96) West Chester University
(5 May 94)

RHODE ISLAND

PROVIDENCE

183 (12) John Carter Brown Library
Brown University (26 May 93)
184 (111) John Hay Library
Brown University (3 June 93)

TEXAS

AUSTIN

185 (52) Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center
University of Texas (11 Aug 93)
186 (134A) -- (8 Oct 93)
187 (Non-Lee) -- (11 Aug 93)

DALLAS

188 (Lee+4)22 Dallas Public Library
(23 Jan 92)

WEST VIRGINIA

MORGANTOWN

189 (Non-Lee) Arthur Spencer Dayton Collection, Charles C Wise, Jr Library, West Virginia University Libraries (30 June 93)

21 Confirmation of ownership received orally.

22 For the identification of this volume, see Chapter 4, Section B, 'Following the Trails of Elusive Copies'.
PART II B: CANADA:

TORONTO
190 (98) Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto

(10 June 91)

PART III: REST OF THE WORLD

AUSTRALIA

SYDNEY
191 (102) State Library of New South Wales (25 June 93)

ITALY

PADUA
197 (101) Biblioteca Universitaria (seen)

EUROPE

192* (147) Private Owner (2 May 91)

FRANCE

PARIS
193 (Lee, 1924, 101-02) Bibliothèque Nationale (3 May 91)

GERMANY

BERLIN
194 (100) Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin (4 Dec 93)

COLOGNE
195 (6) Universitäts- und Stadtbibliothek, Köln (24 Apr 91)

STUTTGART
196 (23) Württembergische Landesbibliothek (17 May 91)

JAPAN

KOBE
198 (38)23 Konan Women’s University (seen)

KYOTO
199 (Non-Lee?)24 Foreign Studies University (seen)

TOKYO

The Kodama Memorial Library Meisei University
Hino-shi25

200 (53) Meisei 1 (seen)
201 (85) Meisei 2 (seen)

23 For a discussion of the provenance of this volume, see Chapter 4, Section C and Table G.
24 For details on this volume, see Chapter 4, Appendix S 6, Table K.
25 The Meisei copy number is given as the third item.
202 (Lee 1924, 101)^26 Meisei 3 (seen)
203 (Non-Lee) Meisei 4 (seen)
204 (67) Meisei 5 (seen)
205 (22) Meisei 6 (seen)
206 (68) Meisei 7 (seen)
207 (104? 27) Meisei 8 (seen)
208 (103) Meisei 9 (seen)
209 (74) Meisei 10 (seen)
210 (130) Meisei 11 (seen)
211 (113) Meisei 12 (14 Sep 94)
212* (Non-Lee?)^28 Kamijo Family

NEW ZEALAND

AUCKLAND

213 (150) Auckland Public Library
(8 Aug 90)

SOUTH AFRICA

CAPETOWN

214 (149) South African Library
(4 June 93)

SWITZERLAND

COLOGNY-GENEVA

215 (8) Bibliotheca Bodmeriana
(23 June 93)

---

^26 For the identification of this volume, see Chapter 4, Section B, 'Following the Trails of Elusive Copies'.
^27 For this doubtful identification, see Chapter 4, Section C and Table E.
^28 For details on this volume, see Chapter 4, Appendix S 6, Table L. Mr Mitsuo Nitta, President, Yushodo Co. Ltd, Tokyo, kindly informed me of this copy in August 1991.
PART IV: COPIES in LEE, CENSUS and LEE, 1906--AT PRESENT UNFOUND

The copy heading, after the Lee number, gives the owner as in the Lee source. The first item for each copy, between angle brackets < >, quotes all the information from Lee, Census. The following items record additional data which could help identify the volume. The items include the most recent sighting.

216 (63) Manchester. -- The Owens College (Christie Library).

1. <Size: 12 7/8 in. x 8 3/8 in. History: acquired in 1898 for £500 of Bernard Quaritch by Edward Donner, Esq., and presented to the Christie Library in memory of the late Thomas Ashton, of Manchester, and of Hyde, Cheshire. Condition: very clean; bound by Bedford; fly-leaf in facsimile; title mounted; last leaf re-bordered at top and bottom.>

2. The following is from the manuscript reply by Thomas Seccombe, 6 March 1901, to Lee's questionnaire, preserved in the Records Office, Shakespeare Centre, Stratford-upon-Avon (ER85/6/1/79): 'There are no annotations in the copy which is a very clean one with a remarkably fine portrait. This last looks as if it has been cleaned by some chemical process' (covering note). No portions of the volume missing; 'a few pages have been mended. It is bound in red morocco in the 'early Bedford style' (Questionnaire).

3. The Christie Library became part of what is now John Rylands University Library, Manchester; the volume was in the JRUL until about 1970; it is now 'no longer available in the [JRUL]. I regret that I am unable to give you any information concerning [its] present location' (Letter, 27 May 1993, Keeper of Printed Books, JRUL).

217 (88) Major-General Frederick Edward Sotheby, Ecton, Northamptonshire.

1. <Size: 12 1/2 in. x 7 3/4 in. History: probably purchased by present owner's ancestor, James Sotheby, c 1700, for £1 6s. Condition: good; fly-leaf and another leaf supplied in facsimile.>

2. '(pre-Folger note) Still there 2/1/22. He called in [indecipherable] as its value not seen' (Note in Quaritch's Lee).

3. Bought by Sabin, Sotheby's, 24 July 1924, lot 181, at the sale of the library of Col H G Sotheby, for £2,375 (Sotheby's Cat).

'Title strengthened by sizing, the portrait very slightly defective and a slit in the title (both carefully repaired), three preliminary leaves in facsimile [T A 1, T A 3-4], the inner margin of [T A 2] and one other preliminary leaf repaired, a small slit in one preliminary leaf repaired and the outer margin of [T A 6] renewed, five leaves defective and

---

29 Thomas Seccombe (1866-1923), critic, biographer, editor, Professor of English; he worked with Sidney Lee on the DNB as assistant editor from 1891 to 1900 (DNB 1922-1930, (1937)).
repaired, some words being supplied in facsimile (sig. A3-4, aa3-4, bbb5), modern red morocco, gilt panelled tooling on sides, inside gilt border, g. e. . . . In addition to those mentioned above, the following minor defects must also be mentioned: margin of A1 repaired and outer margin of A5 renewed; corner of five leaves slightly defective and repaired, D6, h6, i4, k3, t3; three leaves very slightly defective and repaired, i3, §§§1, ss6; slits or blank margins mended in six leaves, S2, S6, T6, g2, dd, aaa5; small holes in o2, f3-4; sig. dd repaired; the rules of four or five leaves cut into' (Sotheby's Cat, 24 July 1924).

218 (91) E. E. Harcourt Vernon, Esq., Grove Hall, Retford.

1. <Size: 13 1/2 in. x 8 5/8 in. History: probably acquired c 1640 by Sir Hardolph Wasteneys, first baronet of Headon Hall, Notts, and on death of the widow of his great-grandson, Sir Hardolph, last baronet (d 1742), passed to the last baronet's great niece and heiress, wife of Col. Anthony Hardolph Eyre (1788-1836), of Grove Hall, Retford. It afterwards devolved on Col. Eyre's daughter and heiress, who married present owner's grandfather, Granville Harcourt Vernon, Esq. (1836-79). Condition: bottom edges much rubbed [Sotheby's Cat, 13 November 1933, 26, says 'this is entirely incorrect']; preliminary leaf containing the sub-title 'The Workes, &c.' missing; fly-leaf, title, and last leaf in facsimile.>

2. Robert M Smith (Daily Telegraph, 7 March 1935, 143) and Otness (126) are incorrect in saying this is Folger 37. Folger 37 does have a Vernon bookplate, but neither the size, nor the wanting leaves of Lee 91 correspond with Folger 37. In any case, Lee 91 was sold in 1933 (see item 3 below) after Folger stopped collecting. Folger Cat RLIN says Folger 37 is non-Lee.

3. The volume appears as lot 156 in Sotheby's Catalogue for 13 November 1933 in which 'the property of Major G. Harcourt Vernon' was sold. The information in the Catalogue includes: 'Bound in brown morocco (13 1/2 in. by 8 1/2 in.) . . . On the fly-leaf is pasted [a] note of ownership [which concludes] "I married the daughter of Col. Eyre and have obtained the service of Messrs. Burt and Tuckett in refurbishing and binding this Volume. Granville Harcourt Vernon. Grove. July 1, 1875." Defects. The title, Ben Jonson's verses, and the last leaf in facsimile. Two other preliminary leaves wanting (folios 8 and 9; Commendatory verses by Digges, etc.; and Head-title with the Names of the Principall Actors). . . . Many leaves have rough edges and some are partly uncut.' The copy of the Catalogue in the British Library has in the margin beside this lot in red ink: 'Perry' (Marsden J Perry?, collector, d 1935), and there is similar mention of names in red ink for many other lots; one could presume they are the purchasers.

4. Sotheby's Cat 13 November 1933 reports the result of the sale as 'How £2,800'. This is a code word for 'bought in'. The fact that this volume was bought in is confirmed by a note in the Sotheby's copy of Lee, Census, 'b/i £2800'. On the use
of ‘How’ as a code word, Dr Roland Folter of H P Kraus, New York, wrote to me, 19 April 1993: ‘The buyer’s name “How” at the Sotheby sale . . . is a “nom de vente”, designating that the book was bought in . . . and returned to the consignor’.

219 (99) Ross R. Winans, Esq., Baltimore.

1. <Size: 12 7/16 in. x 8 in. History: apparently offered for sale in 1894 for £460 by Ellis & Elvey, London booksellers, with a genuine title which was afterwards transferred to another copy. Acquired by the present owner, July 1899, of Ellis & Elvey. Condition: fly-leaf inlaid; title facsimile.>

2. ‘According to a note . . . in the Bradley Martin English Literature sale catalogue (30 April 1990, lot 2584n), Ross Winan’s library “was bought [en bloc] by the . . . G. D. Smith Co., and sold by them in the Halsey and various owners’ sale, Anderson, 17-19 February 1919”, [but] ABPC lists no First Folio in the sale’ (Letter from Sotheby’s, NYC, 20 July 1993). Lee, Census is the last sighting.


2. The following is from the manuscript reply by William Fulford Adams written on Lee’s questionnaire, preserved in the Records Office, Shakespeare Centre, Stratford-upon-Avon, the covering note of which, addressed to Lee, is dated Little Faringdon 11 March 1901 (ER85/6/1 (i)): The volume was given to him by his aunt, Miss Adams of Sydenham, in 1890. ‘The title is mounted on a stiffer paper and the 23 of the date is wanting.’ He mentions twice how beautifully copied the manuscript is on the last leaf. In answer to the question ‘What portions, if any, of your volume are supplied in facsimile?’, he replied: ‘I should say none.’ ‘Thomas Paulin had the book bound in 1743. . . . The edges were somewhat carelessly cut but not anywhere touching the text. It seems to have been well read and cared for.’

3. Adams, who was educated at Marlborough (1845) and Exeter College, Oxford (BA 1856), was vicar of Little Faringdon, Gloucestershire (1864-1901), Rector of Weston-Sub-Edge, Worcestershire (1901-15), then at Noke, Islip, Oxfordshire till c. 1920 (Crockford’s Clerical Directory, 1902, etc). (He was no longer at Noke, Islip c. 1920, and he does not appear in Crockford’s ‘Resignations’ or ‘Obituary’ for 1920 or 1921-22.)

4. Adams wrote a postcard from Weston-Sub-Edge rectory, in 1915, around June, to A H Mayhew, bookseller in London, in reply to the latter’s solicitation for Adams’s
copy made at Folger’s behest: ‘Sir I have no intention of selling my First Folio Shakespeare’ (Case File 1996, Folger Library).

221 (115) Lord Zouche of Parham.
1. <Size: 12 3/8 in. x 7 3/4 in. History: J. Spode was a former owner. Acquired c 1854 by the Hon. Robert Curzon, present owner’s grandfather. Condition: fly-leaf in facsimile; title re-backed and mended; last leaf inlaid; several leaves in the Comedies, and fifteen leaves (pp. 369-98) [sic] in the Tragedies, supplied from Second Folio; preliminary leaves re-arranged by binder.>

2. This copy is not now at Parham (Letter from Parham, 17 February 1993). Robert Curzon, 15th Lord Zouche, died in 1914; his sister, 16th Baroness Zouche, died in 1917. There was a Zouche sale at Sotheby’s, 9 November 1920, but it did not contain the First Folio. Parham Park was sold in 1922. Lee, Census is the last sighting.

222 (120) George F. Richardson, Esq., Lowell, Massachusetts.

2. ‘Lev. mor., by Sanford . . . (no. of leaves remargined, some entirely so, others merely in lower and lateral margins and corners; in only a few places do the repairs extend into text; an unwashed copy, with some time discolorations)’ (ABPC, Lot 309, 25-26 February 1937). ABPC does not give the buyer.

3. ‘Richardson had two copies of the First Folio; both were sold at Rains Galleries in New York in 1937, lots 308 and 309 . . . . Lot 309 [=Lee 120: the facsimile leaves in Lee, Census, match those in Rains’s catalogue, except that A1 is in facsimile in Lee and not in Rains, and 3b5 is in facsimile in Rains and not in Lee] was purchased by, as I read the initials, ‘TE’ or ‘ET’ [The vertical strokes of the two ms letters in the catalogue margin are combined], who bought several other important items in the sale (such as Milton’s Paradise Lost)’ (Letter, 17 December 1991, from Leslie A Morris, Curator of Books and Manuscripts, the Rosenbach Museum & Library). The price in the catalogue margin is [$3,800. Dr Roland Folter of H P Kraus in New York wrote to me, 19 April 1995: ‘I am quite sure that the buyer’s initials “TE” . . . stand for Thoms & Eron, a New York bookseller quite active at the time, but no longer present nowadays’.

223 (125) John Claude Daubuz, Esq., Killian, Truro.
1. <Size: 12 5/11 in. x 7 9/16 in. History: D. C. Dallas was a former owner. Acquired by present owner of A. Maurice & Co., London booksellers, in Aug. 1896. Condition: fly-leaf, title, and all preliminary leaves and last five leaves supplied in
facsimile; first eight leaves of 'Tempest' and first ten leaves of 'Cymbeline' supplied from Third Folio, and more than fifty other leaves supplied from Second Folio.>

2. Sotheby's Cat, 25 July 1932, lot 129A says:

'The first 9 preliminary leaves and the last 5 leaves in facsimile; 47 other leaves supplied from the Second or Third Folios [thirty Second Folio leaves are specified and seventeen Third]; a pink stain caused by damp in the right hand top corner; the margin of several leaves repaired in a few cases slightly affecting the text (ss5-6; tt1-4); one or two small holes in a few leaves; red morocco, panelled sides, g. e. by Riviere . . . (12 3/8 in. by 7 1/2 in.)

The volume was bought by Marks for £100.

224 (133) T. E. Watson, Esq., Newport, Monmouthshire.


2. The following note was sent '12 June 1915 [from] St Mary's Lodge, Newport, Mon.', to A H Mayhew, bookseller in London, in reply to the latter's solicitation for Watson's copy made at the behest of Folger: 'Dear Sir In reply to yours of 10th I am not disposed to sell my First Folio Shakespeare Yours truly [signed] T E Watson' (Case File 1996, Folger Library).


1. <Size: 12 1/2 in. x 8 1/2 in. History: acquired by present owner c 1885. Condition: well worn; fly-leaf, title, and preliminary leaves not in original condition; the whole of 'Measure for Measure' and 'Winter's Tale' in facsimile and some twenty-five other leaves.>

2. A reply sent from 'Belmont, Sidmouth. 11th June 1915', to A H Mayhew, bookseller in London, in response to the latter's solicitation for this copy made at Folger's request, says in part: 'Mr. R. H. Wood . . . died seven years ago. The present owner of the . . . Folio is serving in the Army: & is not anxious to sell. If you care to offer £1,900 net for the book, I will send on your proposal--but nothing less . . . [signed] S. R. Wood'. Folger did not buy, writing to Mayhew: 'The price suggested by S. R. Wood for his copy, £1900, is of course prohibitive . . . The copy isn't worth a quarter of what they ask for it.' (Case File 1996, Folger Library).
226 (144) Sir Everard Philip Digby Pauncefort-Duncombe, Bart., Brickhill Manor, Bletchley.

1. <History: acquired c 1840 by Philip Pauncefort-Duncombe, Esq., great-grandfather of third baronet, the present owner; four leaves in 'Romeo and Juliet' were long missing; two-thirds of the volume were accidentally destroyed by fire at Riviere's bookbinding works in London in 1898. Condition: only 175 leaves preserved in modern binding.>

2. '(still has) 1920' (De Ricci slip--see Cue Titles).

227 (Lee+11) W C Knight-Clowes.

1. The volume was first recorded by Lee in 1906:

The external literary history gives this copy, despite its inferior condition, great interest. It belonged to Charles Knight, whose edition of Shakespeare was the most popular of all editions in the nineteenth century. Knight studied the First Folio with exceptional zeal. His copy of the volume, which now belongs to his grandson, Mr. W. C. Knight-Clowes, has peculiar fascination for students. Mr. Clowes has been good enough to lend the book to me for a long term of months. Its imperfections are, unfortunately, very palpable, and it cannot be placed above third-class copies in any catalogue raisonné. Of 908 original leaves 27 are lost; 881 alone survive. All but three of the preliminary leaves have disappeared, and the edges of those that survive are damaged. Other missing leaves are two of "The Taming of the Shrew," two leaves of "Henry VIII," one leaf of "Troilus" (f), two leaves of "Romeo and Juliet," two leaves of "Hamlet" (pp. 3,4), and the last twelve leaves of "Cymbeline," with which the volume ends. All the missing leaves, including six in the preliminary section, have been supplied from the facsimile typed reprint of 1807. The lost leaf of the "Merry Wives" is bound out of its due place, and has been needlessly supplied in duplicate from the 1807 reprint.

The dimensions are 12 5/16 x 8 1/4 inches. The volume has been roughly rebound in stamped russian leather at a comparatively recent date. There are no textual singularities. A few pages are defaced by manuscript notes, for the most part senseless scribble, in seventeenth century handwriting. On the lower part of page 204 of the Histories--at the end of the play of "Richard III"--appear in one hand the name "the Lady Sarah Hearst," and in another hand, "the Lady Mary Buckinham [sic]."

Below the prologue to "Troilus" is written the couplet:

When malt is cheap again, mark w't I say
Weele laugh, and drink, and make an hallowday.
To Baccus & Ceres. (Lee, 1906, 25-27)

2. '313 x 210 mm. . . . Stamped russia (XIXth century)' (De Ricci slip--see Cue Titles).

3. Sold at Sotheby's 29 July 1946: 'The property of Mrs. [Winifred L.] Clowes [Lot] 197 . . . the first 6, last 12, and 9 other leaves (S3-4 of Comedies, T3/4 Histories, ...f1 Histories ; gg1/2 Tragedies ; pp. 3/4 Tragedies [the contents of this parenthesis, including anomalies, are accurately transcribed]) in facsimile, upwards of 70 leaves have some part of the page torn away, or slits, rust-holes, etc., some of these defects being repaired; E6 is misbound between E1 and E2, a facsimile being inserted
in its proper place, Russia (312mm by 207mm) . . . [MS:] [£]340 [purchased by] Foyle’ (Sotheby’s Cat).

228 (Lee+13) The Waller Copy

1. ‘A large but defective copy, measuring 13 x 8 1/2 inches, fetched £420 at Sotheby’s sales rooms on 29th July, 1904, when it was bought by Mr. Waller. The portrait-title was wanting, together with the first leaf of “Troilus and Cressida,” and the last leaf of the volume. There were several signs of injury by fire. The margins of forty leaves were burnt, in seventeen cases with injury to the text. Other defects appeared in both the preliminary leaves and the text of the plays’ (Lee, 1906, 27).

2. Otness is incorrect in identifying this volume with Folger 30 (129) and in suggesting it ‘could be’ the Dallas Public Library Copy (59)—see Chapter 4, Section B, ‘Following the Trails of Elusive Copies’. The last sighting is Lee, 1906, 27.

PART V: COPIES IN LEE, CENSUS: ‘UNTRACED’ (and STILL UNTRACED), and ONE LOST NON-LEE COPY

For the Lee copies, the heading begins with the Lee number, then gives the copy name as in Lee, Census. The first item for each copy, between angle brackets < >, quotes all the information Lee gives there. The following items record additional data which could help identify the volume.

(54) Present Owner Untraced. -- The Nasmyth Copy.

1. <Size: 13 in. x 8 1/2 in. History: apparently acquired c 1730 by John, Lord Carmichael (afterwards third Earl of Hyndford), whose book-plate it bears [‘on the reverse side of the portrait’—Sotheby’s Cat, 26 February 1874). Acquired by Robert Nasmyth, of Edinburgh, c 1830, at sale of whose library in Feb. 1874 it was bought by Quaritch for £154. Condition: original binding; some stains; fly-leaf wanting.>

2. The volume was sold at the sale of ‘the valuable library of the late Robert Nasmyth’ at Sotheby’s, 26 February 1874, lot 584 and, as just noted, was bought by Quaritch for £154. (Quaritch did not buy the Second Folio, the next lot.) The catalogue says:

Apparently in the original binding [Lee, Census states definitively ‘Original binding’] . . . [T^A1] is wanting, the top of [T^A2] cut off, also misplaced by binder, and although not very material, we here enumerate the few trifling defects as follows: H23 [sic. =H2-3?] has two small ink spots; small hole in pages 155-6, also at page 275 one word deficient of three letters in the word “Meane;” aa2 small ink spot, and a few other leaves slightly stained by water and ink, otherwise AN EXTRAORDINARILY LARGE AND FINE COPY (13 by 8 1/2 inches): a leaf at p. 263 having only a portion of the lower margin cut, thus showing what was the original size of the paper when issued. The breadth of this copy is exactly a quarter of an inch wider than Mr. Daniel’s [=Lee 5], which sold for the sum of Seven Hundred and
Sixteen Pounds Two Shillings [Lee 5 measured 12 3/4 by 8 in, Lee, Census]. (Sotheby's Cat, 26 February 1874)

Quaritch can supply no further record of this copy (Letter, 19 October 1993).

(104) Present Owner Untraced. -- The Fiske Harris Copy.

1. <Size: 12 5/8 in. x 8 1/8 in. History: bought c 1860 of Pickering, London, by S. Rider, bookseller of Providence, who sold it to C. Fiske Harris of that city. [Winsor, No. 6.] After Fiske Harris's death it was sold in 1883 to a collector in Kentucky. Condition: verses, title, and the actors' names in facsimile; portrait inlaid; other preliminary leaves mended and inlaid; bound by Riviere.>

2. For earlier suggestions that this volume was at the Folger and for the possibility that it is Meisei 8, see Chapter 4, Section C and Appendix S 5, Table E.


2. The bookseller George D Smith's annotated and priced copy of the Bangs & Co Sewell Sale Catalogue, 18-22 January 1897, in the possession of Mr John C Priddy, Richmond, VA, gives the following for the First Folio, lot 3422: 'Lines before the title reprinted. Title-page (except the portrait which is inlaid) in fac-simile. Preliminary leaves to the catalogue, partly from other copies and partly in fac-simile. Catalogue repaired. Text all perfect, the last four leaves of Cymbeline being in exact fac-simile by Harris. . . . crimson levant morocco, tooled and gilt and gilt edges, by H. Stamper.' A marginal note confirms that $500 was paid and adds 'Richmond.' (the buyer? George H Richmond was a New York bookseller).

3. Lee, 1906, 11, n1, notes that this copy was in Folger's possession--by implication by 1902.


(139) Present Owner Untraced. -- The Burra Copy.

1. <Size: 12 in. tall. History: acquired by James S. Burra Esq., of Ashford, Kent, and sold at Sotheby's April 1902. Condition: worn; fly-leaf, title, preliminary leaves, and last leaf in facsimile; many leaves mended and made up.>

2. 'The late John S Burra sold his first folio some years ago' (Letter from John S Burra, 11 Jan [1912], Homestall, Faversham, in Provenance File for Folger 51).
3. The library of James S Burra, including a Second Folio was sold at Sotheby’s, 14 December 1911, but Lee 139 was not in the sale (Sotheby’s Cat).

(153) Present Owner Untraced. -- Canterbury Cathedral Copy.

1. <History: disposed of by the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury Cathedral, in whose library the copy had been for a long time, c 1880.>

2. I found no reference to this volume in the DononWBook, but a manuscript record of books in the Cathedral Library lists the First Folio: what may be a shelf-mark, which looks like ‘Z 12’, is crossed out, with ‘Sold’ written above it. Concerning condition it says: ‘The imperfect title page has been restored in M. S. Four missing leaves have been inserted from another copy. See “Brutet’s Manuel”’. (I have no title, date or page number for this document, but the reference (which is to another volume) at the top of the leaf in column 2 is ‘w/k - 5 - 2’). Lee, Census is the last mention.


2. Lee, Census is the last mention. The suggestion that this copy might be Lee 38 or Lee 152 is shown to be incorrect in Chapter 4, Section C.

(Non-Lee). The Foley Copy, Ruxley Lodge, Claygate, Surrey.


2. Became part of the Foley family library sometime after 1829, when the library had only the fourth folio. In 1919, when the library was owned by Gerald Henry Foley, 7th Baron Foley of Kidderminster, it had a copy of each of the seventeenth-century Folios. The library was auctioned at Ruxley Lodge by Castiglione & Scott on 23-25 October 1919 (Freeman, Anatomy, vii and 1).

‘The First Folio, a decent copy in modern morocco (the letter-press part of the title supplied in perfect facsimile by Harris” and [according to Pickering] “last lls. restored, verses inlaid”), fetched [because of the operation of the ring] just £100 from Quaritch’ (Freeman, Anatomy, 61). It was acquired in the third round of the post-sale settlement among the book dealers by Charles J Sawyer Ltd for £1550 (Freeman, Anatomy, 94-95). ‘A manuscript note by Seymour de Ricci . . . records what must be this copy in the stock of Gabriel Wells of New York, in 1921’ (Freeman, Anatomy, 124), but the Freemans have been unable to trace the volume itself. They had still not traced it in

---

30 Canterbury Cathedral Library, Benefactor’s[or Donor’s] Book, MS E 40, in the Cathedral Archives Library.
1992 (Freeman, 'Post-Operational Notes', 341). For the possibility that this volume is Folger 21, see Chapter 4, Section C and Appendix S 5, Table F.
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Plate 8. The title-page of Sidney Lee's Facsimile edition of the First Folio, 1902.
Appendix I

FACSIMILES OF THE FIRST FOLIO

The facsimile of choice for most purposes other than historical is Charlton Hinman's *Norton Facsimile* (numbers 9 and 12 below); the CD-ROM and digital versions (numbers 14 and 15) have their own special virtues. As I increasingly recognised the primacy of the *Norton Facsimile* among the printed facsimiles, I switched my objective for this appendix from completeness of description, and necessary length, to interest and utility. Accordingly, the entries are intended as an overview for anyone with an interest in the facsimiles, as a point of departure and guide for those who wish to consult a facsimile other than *Norton*, and as an introduction to the content of and differences between the two *Norton* editions. They are as brief as these purposes permit. As suggested in Chapter 1, the sheer number of them bears witness to the extent of the demand to get close to Shakespeare's text.

As for the Second, Third and Fourth Folios, I know of three facsimile editions of the First Folio in the nineteenth century and there have been ten in the twentieth. The following list assigns a reference name to each and gives a synoptic view of their appearance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facsimile Editions of the First Folio with Dates of Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Methuen 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Yale 1955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 To trace the Methuen and Routledge sets, see the respective entries for their First Folio facsimiles. D S Brewer is an imprint of Boydell & Brewer Ltd, Woodbridge, Suffolk and Dover, NH, printed in Great Britain by the Moxon Press Ltd, Leeds. All three Brewer Folios were published in 1985, contain the same five-page introduction by Marvin Spevack and the same selected bibliography on the three Folios. The Spevack introduction focuses on the value of these later Folios for editors and textual scholars: 'they are early links in the chain of editorial activities which must be considered in any attempt to restore or recreate the true text' [4]. There is no information on the process of reproduction. The facsimiles are respectively of copies in Cambridge, at Trinity College (shelfmark Grylls 10:230), Queens' College and King's College.

2 Louis Marder lists eight of these (numbers 1-4, and 6-9) with brief descriptions in 'First Folio Reproductions Past & Present: A Brief Bibliography', *Shakespeare Newsletter* 18 (1968), 33-34.
Most printed editions are at pains to claim accuracy. Only Norton achieves it, though Applause is mostly based on Norton. Concerning the meaning of the word ‘accuracy’ when it comes to facsimiles, it is well to echo the double caution of Gary Taylor, writing in the Oxford Companion. First, facsimiles ‘constitute modern “editions”, shaped—like all others—by the assumptions of a scholarly intermediary’—for example, by the editor’s choice to reproduce either a single copy, and if so which one, or pages or formes from multiple copies, and if so which pages or formes, and in which state. Second, assuming a photographic (as opposed to a type) facsimile, ‘photography itself, like any other medium, communicates its own message: that what you see is real, accurate, genuine’. To assess what one is looking at in a facsimile, one needs to know what choices the editor has made and what errors the method of reproduction has, or may have, introduced. Whether or not we can be completely satisfied on both scores concerning the other printed facsimiles described below, we can be sure concerning the Norton.

All printed editions are in folio except Booth’s, Halliwell-Phillipps’s and the Meisei ‘Compact’ edition. The Yale (sometimes called the Kökeritz) edition is in reduced folio. All are in one volume except the National. Booth and Staunton were issued in parts. Absent from this list is a facsimile which only reached the planning stage; W W Greg opens his preface to The First Folio saying that ‘This account of the Shakespeare First Folio was originally planned as an introduction to a facsimile of the volume. The scheme for a facsimile fell through, but the introduction got itself written in an extended form’.

The reasons typically given for their publication are: affordability, as the price of the original went up; appearance, in contrast to damaged and defaced originals; and convenience, in the case of those in smaller formats. One of the advertisements for Booth’s can represent all of them so far as their purpose and selling arguments are concerned:

After accuracy, the next object is to place within easy attainment of the many a book the possession of which has hitherto been restricted to the very fortunate few. Henceforth for less than two pounds may be secured, in a perfect state, the coveted of all English book-collectors,—a Volume which in the Original, and in a condition more or less of defacement and repair, would be considered cheap at a hundred; and this in form and condition more pleasing to the eye—a “cheerful semblance” of its prototype—and much more convenient for use. The Folio of 1623, although so important for the authority of its Text, from its rarity may almost be regarded as a sealed book.

For the entries below, the title-page is quoted in full, all in italics. The first item given after the title is the measurement in millimetres. The vertical measurement is taken in the centre of the first page of The Tempest. The horizontal measurement, taken

---

4 The first advertisement (pp 3-4) bound in to the Booth volume cited below.
from the centre of the fore-edge to the point where the paper meets the binding (the head or tail band if there is one), is very approximate.

**Facsimile Editions**

1. **Wright** [no title-page, London, 1807-08]

   374 x c. 231 mm. Letterpress, type facsimile. Published by Vernor and Hood.\(^5\)

   Printed at the foot of \(Pi A1+1V\) is: 'Printed by E. and J. Wright, St. John's Square' and at the foot of 3b6\(^5\): 'J. Wright, Printer, No. 38, St. John's Square.' According to William Jaggard, it was edited by Francis Douce.\(^6\) I have not found the source for this edition. The paper was specially made;\(^7\) there are two watermarks, 'SHAKESPEARE' and 'J WHATMAN 1806', which sometimes appear singly and sometimes on the same leaf. This edition was also issued on India paper—three copies according to Jaggard;\(^8\) there is one in the British Library.

   Nothing has been added to this volume—no title-page of its own, no preface, introduction, or advertisement. Its distinguishing features include the two imprints, the watermarks, and the Wrights' signatures (arabic numerals below the bottom rule).

   This was the first facsimile edition, appearing a century after Rowe and over half a century before the successor facsimile edition, in a decade in which the average price of an original had reached £44. Although it was 'greedily bought up',\(^9\) it was criticised for inaccuracy. William Upcott found 368 errors.\(^10\) Lionel Booth, supporting claims to accuracy for his own edition, speaks of 'the complaints made against the last reprint'.\(^11\) With scarcely disguised glee, he cites Upcott's findings, the "'[368] errors of the press" requiring to be corrected; thus rendering every copy if not so corrected, utterly useless for all purposes of study or critical inquiry'.\(^12\)

2. **Booth** *Shakespeare As put forth in 1623. A Reprint of Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies. Published according to the True Originall Copies.* London. Printed by Isaac Jaggard, and Ed. Blount, 1623; and Re-Printed for Lionel Booth, 307 Regent Street. 1864.

   226 x c. 172 mm. Letterpress, type facsimile. Same pagination as the original. This edition was issued in three parts: *Comedies* 1862 (including the original preliminaries), *Histories* 1863 and *Tragedies* 1864, each with its own title-page and a two page 'Collation'. These are bound in one volume in the British Library copy.\(^13\)

---

\(^5\) As stated in the advertisement bound in to the British Library copy of the Staunton edition, shelfmark 11765.k.4.


\(^7\) Ibid.

\(^8\) Ibid.

\(^9\) The fourth advertisement (p 4) bound in to the Booth volume cited below.

\(^10\) Jaggard, 510.

\(^11\) The first advertisement (p 4) in the Booth volume.

\(^12\) The fourth advertisement (p 1) in the Booth volume.

\(^13\) Shelf-mark 11766.cc.24.
(After the Tragedies in this volume, 'Directions to the Binder' are printed, making provision for binding the three parts into one volume.) This volume has its own title-page, quoted in full above. On its verso: 'London: Printed by J. Strangeways and H. E. Walden . . .'. I have not found the source for this edition. There is no introduction. The volume has its own set of signatures. There is through-numbering (one series through the three parts) at the foot of each page.

There are five informative advertisements bound into this volume. Before the Comedies: (1) three pages, 18 December 1861. Before the Histories: (2) two pages, 13 October 1863. Before the Tragedies: (3) two pages, November 1864. Following the Tragedies: (4) four pages, 1862 and (5) two pages, nd. The fourth gives the price of Part I, Comedies, as 10s. 6d. Booth stressed the value for money of his edition in the third advertisement (p 1) by referring to the original 'sold lately for the large sum of 716', the Daniel copy sold in 1864. The fifth advertisement promotes reprints of quartos priced at 5s. each.

Jaggard said this edition was issued in two sizes: 'Fcp. 4°' and large paper, two of the latter on pure vellum. The first (p 1) and fourth (p 4) advertisements just cited say there will be editions in octavo and folio. The third expresses the intent to print Pericles separately 'to be bound up with this edition' (p 4). (See item 1 under 'Facsimiles of Parts of the First Folio' below.)

From the advertisements one gets an over-riding impression of Booth's seriousness of purpose and of the scrupulous care he insisted upon to achieve accuracy. He was clearly sensitive to the needs of textual scholars, as evidenced by the last quotation in the 'Wright' entry above and by his comment in the third advertisement (p 1) that the effect of any mistakes 'would be to increase the perplexities of Shakespearean criticism'. The type is smaller than the pica used in 1623. This, with the paper size chosen, permitted Booth to maintain precisely the page-by-page make-up of the original. Despite its relatively small format, it is remarkably legible. Sidney Lee called it the 'best facsimile' of those published in the nineteenth century and commented that it is 'very clear, and the typography is at all points trustworthy'. Dover Wilson described it as 'remarkably reliable and very handy, being in quarto format, and issued in three separate volumes'. Both the TLS and Modern Philology reviews of the Yale facsimile in 1955 praised the accuracy of Booth. TLS said: 'If one wishes to read the plays in an accurate Folio text . . . the Booth type-facsimile of 1864 is the obvious choice.' In Modern Philology Fredson Bowers commented that anyone desiring accuracy must still rely on Lee’s facsimile or ‘on the amazingly accurate type facsimile of Lionel Booth’.

14 Jaggard, S36.
15 Lee, Facsimile, xxxv.

382 x c. 239 mm. Photolithography, the first to use this process. The two originals for this edition were West 13 (British Library) and West 55 (now at the Huntington). There is no preface or introduction; in fact, nothing has been added other than the Staunton title-page. ‘Printed on toned paper’.18 There are no watermarks or chain lines.

This edition was issued in parts:19 the advertisement bound in announces that the work will be published in sixteen monthly parts at 10/6 and, when completed, appropriately bound, at £8 8s. (The average price of Lee Class I originals in the 1860s was £565 and of all originals £305.) The title-page of the parts differs in wording somewhat from that quoted above. The British Library copy just cited has bound in the first fourteen of the parts’ title-pages.

To promote its subject’s claim to accuracy, the advertisement stresses that the Wright edition has the 368 misprints referred to earlier; it then seeks to criticise the Booth edition without naming it by calling it the ‘diminished copy’ and ‘only of a quarto size’, and saying its publisher ‘bespeaks indulgence for errors which he appears to know are inseparable from his undertaking’ (a misrepresentation of Booth if the reference is to his advertisements). However, Louis Marder criticises the Staunton edition for ‘blurring of the type, spreading of the lines, uneven impression, much touching up of the plates, using of pages from more than one edition . . . Variations from the known texts indicate that excessive liberties were taken with the plates’.20


203 x c. 125 mm. Photolithography, but Duncan C Dallas, defending his own projected facsimile, comments: to say that this edition was lithographed is ‘an error. It was photo-zincotype, which, like photo-lithography in this class of work, requires numerous manual erasures and repairs, thus tampering with the text’21 (as demonstrated

---

18 Advertisement bound in to British Library copy shelf-mark 11765.k.4.
19 ‘Issue began serially in 1864’—Jaggard, 539.
20 ‘First Folio Reproductions’, 33.
21 Footnote in Dallas’s advertisement at the end of The Tempest volume, referred to in item 2 (a) under ‘Other Facsimile Printings’ below.
by Charlton Hinman’s analysis cited two paragraphs below). The entry for this volume in the Chatto and Windus ‘List of Books’, bound into the British Library copy\(^{22}\) simply says that it was reproduced ‘by a photographic process’, and gives the price as 10s. 6d. While the volume had the advantages of cheapness and portability, the text is very small, unclear and difficult to read. It has its own set of signatures. It was also published in New York, 1887, by Funk and Wagnalls.

As Hinman says, Halliwell-Phillipps seems to have had ‘nothing to do with the production of the work’.\(^{23}\) His Preface, seven pages, states how important the First Folio is and, play by play, indicates whether the Quarto or the Folio is the first edition. At the end of the Preface (xi) he says that ‘the present average value of a perfect copy is £500’; indeed, the average price for Lee Class I Folios in the 1870s was around £516. The Chatto and Windus List of Books makes the usual claim for ‘the strictest accuracy in every detail’, while Halliwell-Phillipps, more moderate and accurate, says in the Preface that ‘it is not of course pretended that any facsimile of an old book will in all cases of minute research entirely supersede the necessity of a reference to copies of the ancient impression’ (xi).

According to Lee ‘the publishers purchased for the purposes of this reproduction a copy [Lee 86] belonging to Thomas Hayes, a Manchester bookseller, which they subsequently sold to Mr. Robert Roberts, of Boston, Lincolnshire’.\(^{24}\) Hinman made ‘a detailed comparison with Lee 86 (now Folger 33) and concluded that it is based upon the latter, ‘and upon it alone, . . . through part of 1 Henry IV. But from the middle of 1 Henry IV [to the end], the facsimile is based exclusively on the Staunton reproduction of 1866.’\(^{25}\) Hinman goes on to assail the volume at some length for inaccuracy, giving examples. He says that it is ‘unreliable by reason of the failure in the initial reproduction process and that its imperfections increase as the plates became worn,’ but ‘far more serious . . . are peculiarities that result from deliberate tampering. . . . Many hundreds, if not thousands, of alterations have been effected, [including] literal emendations . . . Many of the changes produce manifest error in an originally acceptable text’ (395). He concludes: ‘Its faults are for the most part very small ones; but they are legion and they sometimes seriously misrepresent the text. . . . Editors of Shakespeare will be well advised to make use of the Halliwell-Phillipps facsimile of the First Folio with the greatest caution, if at all’ (400).

---

\(^{22}\) Shelf-mark C.34.i.18.


\(^{24}\) Lee, Facsimile Introduction, xxxv.

\(^{25}\) ‘Halliwell-Phillipps Facsimile’, 396.

399 x c. 248 mm, the tallest facsimile. Letterpress, type facsimile. The text pages have nothing added and are very clear. There is no introduction but there is a one-page preface which, claiming scrupulous accuracy for the text, says it is printed ‘in a *special antique type*, such as was actually employed in the “First Folio,” upon *hand-made paper*, with rough edges, specially manufactured for this work’. It was issued in three volumes, cloth bound for £10/10/-, and in an elaborate morocco binding, with deeply indented medallions front and back, for £15/15/-. The first volume has Ben Jonson’s ‘To the Reader’ and the portrait on successive leaves rather than facing, and does not reproduce the letterpress of the title-page. The Histories volume contains *Troilus and Cressida*.

The preface gives the reasons for publishing as the ‘scarcity of the original’ and the ‘enormous price’ it had attained. In the 1880s the average price for Lee Class 1 copies was around £526 and for all copies £341. Another justification given for the edition is the recent theory that the errors in the original are ‘essential portions of an elaborate cypher by means of which the plays convey . . . a second or hidden narrative bearing upon the vexed question of authorship’. Confessing himself a Baconian, the writer wants ‘every lover of Shakespeare’ to have the means—that is, the *National Shakespeare* edition—‘of forming his own opinion.’ The tone of the preface is unashamedly nationalistic (‘Subscribed by Command of her Majesty the Queen; needless to remind any Briton of the present day that the works of William Shakespeare are no small part of our national heritage. In the most distant quarters of the world (wherever the English language has penetrated) . . .’; the publisher hopes the edition ‘may be found worthy of England’s National Poet . . .’ and so on).

The volumes contain twenty engraved illustrations of the plays by Sir J. Noël Paton. In addition, there are photographic reproductions of the ‘most interesting and authentic portraits of the great dramatist’.


370 x c. 230 mm. Letterpress for the modern preliminaries and collotype for the First Folio. Printed on ‘pure linen rag, toned with natural yellow ochre only’. A preliminary leaf says a thousand copies were printed; all of these were ‘taken up long before publication’; it has often been difficult to purchase since. The source copy is

---

26 [No author], ‘The First Folio of Shakespeare: Facsimile’ *Athenaeum*, no. 3932, (3 January 1903), 19. This was a very favourable review of Lee’s facsimile.
27 Ibid.
one of those now in the Huntington (West 53, Lee 21). On the verso of the title-page it says 'Photographed in the Bodleian Library'. There are five pages of subscribers followed by Lee's Introduction (twenty-five pages). Replete with unsubstantiated generalisations, this Introduction marked a turning-point in bibliography (for the reaction it provoked, see the references under 'Lee's Facsimile Introduction' in the index). Lee has added through-pagination and act/scene/line references (to the Oxford edition) at the foot of each page (letterpress).

Because the method of reproduction has a direct bearing on the accuracy of a facsimile and because Lee used collotype, this is the place to note why Lee's facsimile is superior to those using photolithography where any touching up is involved. No less an authority than A W Pollard made the point most succinctly:

In photolithography it is quite possible to touch up a blurred negative when placed on the stone, and therefore quite possible to touch it up wrongly and turn one letter into another. In collotype, on the other hand, when the negative is once transferred to the gelatine surface, no touching up is possible. If this be so, this is the first facsimile of which the process itself is its own guarantee, a really important point.28

This remains the best facsimile of a Folio (in contrast to an ideal Folio, represented by numbers 9 and 12 below). In 1954, Charles Tyler Prouty called Lee's the 'best photographic facsimile' commenting that it 'commands a very substantial price'.29 Fredson Bower's judgement is quoted at the end of number 2 above. In 1963, Charlton Hinman praised 'the excellent "Lee" facsimile', contrasting it with 'the far less reliable "Yale" facsimile'.30 On another occasion he spoke of the accuracy of Lee's collotype method of reproduction, illustrating this with the fact that Lee's edition 'clearly reproduces a hair'.31


345 x c. 230 mm. Photo-zincography. J H P Pafford comments that 'the facsimile was printed from line blocks and Messrs. Methuen tell me that the source volume was dis-bound so that these blocks could be made'.32 On the verso of the preliminary leaf preceding Ben Jonson's verses: 'Printed by William Brendon and Son, Ltd. Plymouth'. There is no introduction. Nothing has been added to the text pages. The

28 'Notes on Books and Work', Library, 2/4 (1903), 96-98 (97). A lively correspondence concerning the accuracy of the different processes of reproduction occurred in TLS, starting with W Day, the printer of the Staunton facsimile (2 January 1903, 5) and continuing on 9 January (10) and 16 January (17). It culminated with a lengthy, technical letter from Horace Hart, the Oxford University Press printer, who printed the Lee facsimile. He put the matter to rest: 'in collotype . . . as the original page exists so it is reproduced—dirt, stains, age-marks and all, in their proper values; no workman's hand is required to touch or retouch, to scrape out or to insert' (23 January, 25). More technical information is given below—from Bowers—in a footnote to the description of number 8.
29 Introduction to the Yale Facsimile, xxix, number 8 below.
30 Hinman, 1, 247-48.
31 'Halliwell-Phillipps Facsimile', 396 and n 5, 395.
volume was issued by Methuen as one of a set of four facsimiles of the seventeenth-century Folios.\textsuperscript{33}

Pafford says ‘the copy, or at any rate the main copy’ for this facsimile was the volume now in the Guildhall Library. He gives ‘some tallying points’ as evidence, though adds that ‘further examination might show that some other source was used for certain pages’.\textsuperscript{34} Regarding accuracy, Pafford alerts us: ‘Then there is the question of touching up’. He cites instances and concludes: ‘examples in the whole book must be numerous’ (126). A pencilled note in the British Library copy\textsuperscript{35} states that ‘this facsimile is not always reliable’, supporting Duncan Dallas’s criticism, quoted below, about the relative reliability of zincography.\textsuperscript{36} In 1955, Fredson Bowers commented that ‘the Methuen Folio has been distrusted for some time for inaccuracies’.\textsuperscript{37}

8. \textbf{Yale} \textit{Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies, A facsimile edition prepared by Helge Kökeritz, with an Introduction by Charles Tyler Prouty}


280 x c. 213 mm. Photolithography. The copyright date is 1954. Printed by Sackett & Wilhelms Lithographing Corporation, New York, NY (verso of modern title-page). The source copy is that of the Elizabethan Club of Yale University. The facsimile has been reduced by approximately one fifth for the sake of ‘convenient handling’ (Preface). Through-pagination has been added and a reference number to the last line of each right-hand column, but not through-line-numbering. Helge Kökeritz provides a one-page Preface concerning the edition. Charles Tyler Prouty’s Introduction (twenty-three pages) covers such topics as the workings of the Elizabethan theatre, the contemporary influences on play texts and the text of the Folio and, briefly, how the Folio was printed. The editor issued a corrigenda slip: this lists a dozen or so ‘important variations (including illegible words, a missing catchword and missing signatures) and strives to minimise the inaccuracies by speaking of ‘minor discrepancies’.

The publication provoked many comments, including ones by Greg and Bowers and a lengthy review in \textit{TLS}. This expresses essentially the same views as Bowers,

\textsuperscript{33} The Methuen facsimile made its contribution to bibliographical history. Dover Wilson in ‘A New Way’ (cited above) said that A W Pollard’s \textit{Shakespeare Folios and Quarters} (1909) was ‘commissioned by Methuen’s as an Introduction to [their] facsimiles of the four Folios’ (53). As we saw in Chapter 1, Section F, Pollard wrote this book, apart from the chapter on the Jaggard quartos, ‘in reply to the Introduction Lee had contributed to the Oxford facsimile’. Wilson called it his ‘magnum opus . . . in which the bibliographical study of Shakespeare took its first great step’ (53).

\textsuperscript{34} Pafford, 126.

\textsuperscript{35} Shelf-mark RAR 822.33.

\textsuperscript{36} In the penultimate paragraph of item 2 under ‘Other Facsimile Printings’ below.

\textsuperscript{37} Bowers’s Yale facsimile review cited above. John W Velz examined fifteen ‘sophisticated’ readings in \textit{Julius Caesar} in the Methuen Second Folio against fifty-three originals at the Folger: the originals ‘showed complete agreement among [themselves] for fourteen of the fifteen readings, and for the fifteenth [Methuen] differs from either of the alternatives found in [the originals]’ (‘The Text of \textit{Julius Caesar} in the Second Folio: Two Notes’, \textit{SQ}, 20 (1969), 95-98 (95).
given below, though in more colourful language (The pages of the First Folio 'were not so squalid, ignoble and sluttish as this facsimile would lead the unwary reader to believe'). As mentioned earlier, Hinman speaks of it as 'far less reliable' than Lee's. D F Foxon in his review in *The Book Collector*, goes further, saying it 'could not hope to stand comparison with [Lee's]' Bowers in an eight-page two-column review in *Modern Philology* (already cited) has the most to say. In less than a third of the article, he witheringly dismisses Prouty's Introduction for inaccuracy and gaps, and lack of balance and clarity. He is even more critical concerning the accuracy of the text. He provides technical information as a basis for countering Kokeritz's claim in the Preface that the facsimile 'reproduces [the Folio] as faithfully and accurately as modern techniques permit'. He demonstrates that 'an extraordinary number of readings were altered or removed in the process of opaquing to excise unsightly blotches'; he piles up examples of altered letters and altered or lost punctuation at line-endings; and finds it 'commonplace' that 'letters look bent, thinned, or broken when in the original they were perfectly sound'. Almost his only positive comment is about its 'remarkably low price'. He advises the textual critic and the bibliographical student 'to utilize the Lee or Booth facsimile'. He is deeply concerned about its claims to accuracy and that it 'is sure to be quoted from in general critical writing as identical with the original'. While there is universal concern about the edition's inaccuracies, several commentators also criticise it for lacking legibility without losing enough bulk to gain convenience. Foxon sums this up: 'A facsimile like this is no use for pure bibliography; it might at least do its best for the general reader'. Despite its faults, this facsimile has been widely distributed through successive printings and the Book of the Month Club.

---

39 Hinman, 1, 247-48.
41 Bowers's technical background is useful for understanding the differing quality resulting from the different processes—for example when comparing Lee, Yale and Norton. I quote only a small part; he has much more to say, for example concerning the effects of retouching and opaquing. Regarding the choice of facsimile process:

At present there are three main methods available: colotype, screened offset, and unscreened or line offset. The first two provide gradations in intensity or shade, colotype actually and screened offset (similar to halftone) by optical illusion. Line offset [used for Yale], like a line or zinc cut for printing, reproduces no values whatever. Everything in the photographed document above a certain intensity registers as black; everything below this level of intensity registers as white. Thus line offset is the least satisfactory of all methods for facsimile reproduction of early-printed books. (50)

The result is that the Yale facsimile suffers badly from show-through, paper stains, etc, resulting in frequent poor legibility. The principal advantage is cost.

355 x c. 240 mm. Photolithography. Copyright, 1968, W W Norton & Company, Inc. With number 12 below, this is the facsimile of choice. The following is abstracted from the advertisement: it is a full-size photographic facsimile, printed on 100 per cent rag paper; no filters were used and no touching-up or opaquing was done. Charlton Hinman selected each page from the twenty-nine 'most satisfactory' copies in the Folger Shakespeare Library—the best two providing only about 180 pages each. He gives the finally corrected state of each page and, where (as in most cases) there was a choice, 'the clearest and cleanest' example (thus producing 'a facsimile not of a Folio but the Folio'). Any blemish in the original is reproduced, but 'it was never necessary to reproduce a seriously imperfect page, or one that is not eminently clear and readable throughout'. Hinman's Appendix B shows which Folger copy was used for each page reproduced. 'The reproductions are in half-tone and the same size as the original', and they present a satisfying verisimilitude of it. Hinman has provided line numbering for each play, appropriately claiming that the First Folio 'provides the one text that can be universally accepted as a permanent standard'. Such a standard through-line-numbering had not existed before. He has also given through-pagination at the foot of each page as well as the Globe (first edition) act/scene/line numbers for the first and last lines of the page.

Appendix A reproduces seven representative pairs of variant pages: the first of each pair gives the uncorrected state, the second the corrected state; two of the former are proof sheets with the proofreader's marks; one of the former shows the first setting of the last page of *Romeo and Juliet*, crossed out for cancellation. The fourth and last section of Hinman's Introduction provides 'a brief commentary on [the] salient characteristics' of these pages (xxv).

The first three sections of Hinman's important Introduction (nineteen pages, double columns) cover: I. The First Folio and its Contents: the Value and the Authority of the Text; II. The Printing and Proofing; and III. The Facsimile. Some of this Introduction is now dated. The reader is advised to consult additionally the new Introduction by Peter Blayney in the second edition, which is treated under number 12 below.

10. **Meisei** *Compact Edition William Shakespeare First Folio 1623 with Introduction by Prof. Mitsuo Kodama Director Kodama Memorial Library Meisei University Meisei University Press Tokyo 1985*

257 x c. 180 mm. This appears to have been reproduced photographically. A printed note on the verso of the title-page states: 'Reprinted as compact size—76% of

---

43 Bound in to the British Library copy RAR822.33.
original First Folio... "To the Reader" and Portrait from former Houghton Copy [= Meisei copy 1] Text from Meisei copies of the First Folio... Published... as 20th Anniversary Commenorative Edition of Meisei University Sold through Yushodo Co. Ltd., Tokyo'. There is no indication as to which copies were used for which text leaves.

There is a four-page introduction by Mitsuo Kodama which describes the impressive Meisei Shakespeare Collection, gives standard information about the First Folio and mentions the provenance of the Houghton copy. Reproduced on the front paste-down are 'AHA' and two coats of arms; these are from the corresponding position in the Houghton copy.44 The edition has its own through-pagination; otherwise, nothing is added. Despite its reduction it is perfectly legible. Copies are hard to find, but there is one in the Stratford Shakespeare Centre Library.


The pages are 'reduced to approximately 90% of their original size'.45 Printed and bound by Webcom. The aim was 'to reproduce the best pages available as clearly as possible'. It was 'assembled by reproducing pages' of the Norton and Yale facsimiles and of originals at the New York Public Library; some twenty-seven pages are from Yale and six from four NYPL copies. 'Because the Yale Facsimile has a white background we have synthesized a slightly darker setting on the computer for uniformity'. On accuracy, presumably the pages from Norton are as reliable as Norton; the pages taken from the Yale facsimile can be no better than described earlier (number 8 above), and for the few pages from the NYPL I do not know (they were photographed by the Library). The 'Appendix' shows the source for each page and identifies pages with known press variants. 'We have reproduced the most fully corrected pages'. The facsimile gives act/scene/line numbers on each page for the first and last lines on that page, uses the Norton through-line-numbers and has its own through-pagination.

It has a three-part introduction: 'Shakespeare and the First Folio' (sixteen pages), 'To the Great Variety of Actors' (twenty-five pages) and 'An Actor's Glossary' (seven pages); and three pages of endnotes. For most of the ground covered in the first part, the reader would be better served by consulting Blayney, First Folio, at least for nuances of accuracy. The approach in the second part is indicated on the back cover: 'Mr. Moston reveals the liberating technique of reading Shakespeare unencumbered by centuries of academic prejudice'. With the actor in mind, it looks at the Elizabethan theatre, based on Henslowe. It covers such topics as rehearsals, acting and production techniques, the Globe, the relationship between actors and the audience, the effect of

44 See Chapter 3, the description of Meisei 1, Provenance, Data, [1^]. for the information on the Houghton copy paste-down.
45 Quotations in this paragraph are from the introduction to the 'Appendix of Folio pages reproduced'.
using 'cue scripts', language, and even how to speak lines. The Glossary explicates words mostly to do with language ('accent', 'alexandrine', alliteration', etc). At the end of the volume, after the 'Appendix of Folio pages reproduced', there is a three-page bibliography. It has a sturdy paperback binding, 'designed to naturally lay flat and stay open for easy reading' (back cover). It is hard to come by outside the USA (the copy the British Library borrowed for me on Interlibrary Loan came from Brigham Young University, Utah) and in 1996 Peter Blayney said it was 'no longer available' in the USA.46


355 x c. 242 mm. Charlton Hinman's 1968 Introduction is reprinted. The facsimile leaves of this volume are the same as in the Norton 1968 edition. The Preliminary leaves are reproduced in the same order as in 1968, contrary to the revised collational formula for the First Folio. For the treatment of this question, see Chapter 2, Sections A and G, and for a synoptic view of how the order in this edition differs from that in the collational formula, see Chapter 2, Appendix M 1. Appendixes A and B of the 1968 edition are reprinted.

The distinctive feature of this edition is the new Introduction by Peter Blayney (eleven double-column pages). The sections are as follows: I. The First Folio and its Publishers; II. The Players and Their Manuscripts; III. The Proofreading; IV. The Printing. Blayney's overall judgement of the 1968 Introduction is that 'while the second half of Hinman's original introduction remains as useful as it was in 1968, time has been less kind to the first two sections' (xxvii).

Because of the importance of Blayney's Introduction, I abstract some of its key points below, to put Hinman's Introduction into perspective and to indicate some of the latest, authoritative thinking:

- 'Hinman tended both to overlook the distinction between printing and publishing and to overestimate the roles of Isaac and William Jaggard in the publication' (xxvii-xxviii).
- 'The most dated and least useful section of Hinman's Introduction is the discussion on pages xi-xiv of the manuscripts from which the plays were printed' (xxix). 'The tabular summary of the plays on pages xiv-xv is in need of several substantive corrections' (xxx).
- On the printing and proofreading his details are authoritative, but his generalisations tend 'both to oversimplify and to offer guesswork as if it were proven fact' (xxx). '[Concerning] the order in which the formes of each quire were set and printed, and the nature of the press-variants he found--his discussion remains authoritative' (xxx). 'Hinman's description of the variants themselves is unexceptionable' (xxxi).

• His account of the proof correction procedure (pp xix-xx) is ‘seriously flawed. . . . The claim that “approximately 750 . . . pages . . . were never proofed at all” is entirely without foundation. [The pages were] routinely proofread and corrected before the presswork began’ (xxxi).

• ‘The Folio contains few variants of any textual significance . . . [Hinman] tended on occasion . . . to exaggerate their value to editors’ (xxxii). (See Chapter 2, Section H and Appendix M 3, on the question of press variants).

• ‘Hinman’s reconstruction of the printing of the Folio, although less widely known than his search for variants, was in fact a far greater contribution to textual studies. . . . One of the more important features of that reconstruction was . . . that the book was “set by formes”’ (xxxii).

• Hinman’s discoveries radically changed conclusions concerning compositor attribution: ‘he repeatedly found that pairs of pages formerly attributed to a single compositor had been set simultaneously from different cases of type’ (xxxiii). ‘Where others had found two or perhaps three compositors, Hinman found five. . . . Subsequent work has increased the number to as many as eight . . . or nine’ (xxxiii-xxxiv).

• Hinman’s conclusion concerning the size of the edition (1200 copies) is wrong. ‘Guessing at work-rates can tell us little or nothing of value about the size of an edition. . . . A guess of 750 copies seems realistic.’ (xxxiii) (See Note 9, Chapter 1, regarding edition size.)

The fourth section of Blayney’s Introduction concludes with a list of all the pages of the First Folio showing the order in which they were set. It indicates which compositor is ‘now believed’ to have set each page (xxxiv) and cites the works of the scholars responsible for compositor attributions which revise Hinman’s.


297 x c. 209 mm. Digitally reproduced by the docutech process. There is no introduction. Nothing has been added to the text pages. The volume was issued as one of a boxed set of four facsimiles of the seventeenth-century Folios, all in the same format. The price for the set was £650; for single volumes, £195. A preliminary page gives the following information: (1) Routledge/Thoemmes Press, 11 Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE. (2) ‘Routledge / Thoemmes Press is a joint imprint of Routledge and Thoemmes Antiquarian Books Ltd.’ (3) ‘Publisher’s Note: The publisher has gone to great lengths to ensure the quality of this reprint but points out that some imperfections in the original book may be apparent’. Another preliminary gives the printer as Antony Rowe Ltd, Chippenham, Wiltshire. The spine title is: ‘Shakespeare’s Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies 1623 Edition’ (gilt).

Telephone conversations in February, 1998, with Routledge, Thoemmes Antiquarian Books Ltd (Bristol) and Antony Rowe Ltd, and a subsequent letter from Routledge, produced the following information (which also applies to the other three volumes in the set). Publication was prompted largely by demand from Japanese libraries and booksellers. The source volume for the First Folio was a printed copy of the Methuen (1910) edition (number 7 above); there appears to have been little or no direct editorial supervision of the reproduction process; ‘no additional touching up was
done for this edition", though it is possible that pages were electronically enhanced; the size was reduced to 87 percent (of the Methuen edition); the docutch process used 600 dots per inch; the volume was printed on Felsted 70 gram paper and the print run was 150 copies. It was issued in May 1997; nine months later approximately two-thirds of the run had been sold.

On the score of accuracy, this is at best as good as the Methuen, 1910, facsimile, which as we have seen is "distrusted". The text is very legible. All pages are clean and there is very little show-through. The principal value of this edition is making more readily available the four facsimiles published by Methuen, especially the Second, Third and Fourth Folios. These offer a unique opportunity to examine printed copies of the Folios in facsimile—an advantage for scholars who have difficulty in gaining access to all four original Folios in one location. For most purposes, if it were a question of all four Folios in facsimile, the best choice would be number 12 for the First Folio and Methuen or Routledge or Brewer for the other three.

In a review of the set, Andrew Murphy, on the one hand welcomes the ‘great benefit’ of having ‘these volumes so readily available in this handsome package’; on the other hand, he regrets their publication because of the errors introduced by the production process and concludes: ‘Republishing these particular facsimiles was an error, and it was error compounded by failing to provide the set with a detailed introduction which could have registered the texts’ provenance and history’. Alacrity to meet demands from the market may explain, if not excuse, the absence of an introduction. In my judgement, making readily available, in facsimile, the Second, Third and Fourth Folios abates any error.


‘This integrated database includes: complete modern text of every Shakespeare play from the Arden Shakespeare 2nd edition; facsimile images of each page of [a first folio] and appropriate early Quarto texts...; poems and sonnets'; and an abundance of secondary material on sources, bibliography, grammar, and bawdy, and Onions’s Glossary, as well as the ‘introductions, notes, appendices and variants from the Arden editions’. The CD-ROM enables one to choose items ‘to study simultaneously on the screen: this could be Arden text only, with Folio or Quarto, and/or notes; source information; glossary and grammar entries and more—in various combinations [and] enables the user to conduct a wide range of searches’. The foregoing, including the title, is from a brochure of Thomas Nelson.

47 Letter from Routledge, 4 March 1998.
48 See the second paragraph under number 7 above.
50 Geoffrey Bullough, ed, Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare; David Bevington’s bibliography, Shakespeare (with ‘over 4,600 titles’); E A Abbott, A Shakespearean Grammar; Eric Partridge, Shakespeare’s Bawdy, C T Onions, A Shakespeare Glossary, ed Robert D Eagleson.
51 The Arden Shakespeare (Walton-on-Thames, [1997]).
Peter Donaldson in the letter cited in the next entry commented that the Arden facsimiles ‘are low-res black and white, but impressive anyway’. In his review of this CD-ROM, G W Pigman celebrates its strong points; first, the ‘wealth of material’, just cited:

second, the default layout is well done: the text occupies one half of the screen, the commentary three-eighths and the variants one-eighth. Scrolling the text window moves the commentary, variants and facsimiles to the appropriate places. Hypertext links are extensive; any reference to Shakespeare, whether in commentary, appendices, the glossaries or grammar, may be followed with a click. Third, some searches are easy to perform.

But he stresses more its ‘deficiencies’. ‘The first problem . . . is its manifest obsolescence’: it has nothing from the Arden third edition; Bevington’s bibliography refers to no ‘work of the past twenty years’; ‘Abbott’s Grammar is a classic, but much work has been done on early modern English during this century. The technical problems are more troubling. It is difficult or impossible to search across different categories at the same time’. He documents the search deficiencies in considerable detail, concluding that ‘this edition is therefore of little use to an editor or a textual scholar. . . . At £2,500, it is a scandal.’

Nicholas Kind, Electronic Development Manager at the Arden Shakespeare, kindly sent me a copy of the lengthy reply to this review he sent to TLS. Some of the points he made were:

- ‘The disc was primarily designed for use in teaching. . . . We did not aim the product at academics working in highly technically advanced institutions . . . but at the vast majority of other academic organisations which have an interest in teaching and studying Shakespeare in new and innovative ways’.
- ‘Any text of Shakespeare used in a publishing venture . . . is subject to a process of mediation . . . The aim . . . of the CD-ROM . . . is, at least partly, to reveal the process of mediation insofar as possible and invite debate about it from student and teacher; and, furthermore, to invite debate about Shakespeare’s use of the materials that were transformed into his plays and poems’.
- ‘Folio and Quarto facsimiles for the whole of Shakespeare’s work . . . are not readily available in any other electronic form’.
- ‘Even if the disc were to have been released in 1997 with the possible Arden 3 texts, there would have only been four them’.
- ‘There is a huge amount of valuable material in the Arden 2 texts. Additionally, . . . the CD-ROM will serve as a valuable archive of a substantial and important part of Shakespeare scholarship in the late twentieth century’.
- ‘We have recently introduced a price of £1,250 for a 1-4 concurrent user licence—considerably less than [the cost of] all the books contained on the disc in hardcopy. [The £2,500 price is for a 1-10 concurrent user licence]’.

In a telephone conversation, Nicholas Kind told me that Arden had decided not to reproduce an ‘ideal’ copy, but to base the facsimile on one copy. This is Folger 7, ie, Lee 35, in Lee’s Class IB (which contains copies ‘in good condition, but with

occasional leaves either supplied from another copy of the First Folio or repaired, i.e. mended, mounted, or inlaid'—Lee, Census, 22) Lee traces its provenance back to c. 1790, when it was acquired by Sir John Thorold. It was sold through Sotheby’s by Sir John’s great-grandson at the famous Syston Park Library sale in 1884 for £590 (Chapter 1, Appendix S/P 9, Table N, 12 December 1884). It passed to Robert Hoe of New York in time to be recorded in William H Fleming’s Bibliography of First Folios in New York City as one of thirteen copies in the city in 1888 (Fleming, 113-14). Fleming examined it ‘very carefully’, measured it with Mr Hoe and described it in some detail—being particularly impressed with its size. It was sold at the Robert Hoe sale through Anderson Auction Co, New York, on 1 May 1911 for $13,000 (Chapter 1, Appendix S/P 12, Table W). It was acquired by Henry Clay Folger in the same month for $14,300 (Chapter 1, Appendix S/P 11, Table V). Folger Cat RLIN says of the preliminaries that A1 has ‘all margins cropped and is mounted and ruled in red; A1+1 (title leaf) is close trimmed and inlaid, completed in ms. facsim., and ruled in red. [Portrait] (on t.p.) in state 2’. It says ‘Imperfections affect text on A5+1 and 3a3,4 and slightly affect text on 19 other leaves’. What steps Arden took to deal with these imperfections I have not discovered.

15. Digital (MIT) The Shakespeare Electronic Archive. Director, Peter S Donaldson, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

This is an ongoing collaborative project, founded in 1992, involving MIT, the Folger, the Huntington and other libraries. It is highly innovative and prospectively rewarding for many. Since the relevant parts are not published, I have relied entirely on Peter Donaldson in this description. The vision of the project is:

an electronic archive, eventually networked and available throughout the world, in which documents of all kinds—films, sound recordings, texts, digital facsimiles—would be linked in electronic form to one another and to the lines of text to which they refer or which they enact.53

The Archive ‘will include in its first phase a complete set of page images in both corrected and uncorrected states for the First Folio, and all copies of Hamlet Q1 (1603—two extant copies) and Q2 (1604/5—seven extant copies)’.54

In March 1998, the archive included:

all states of all pages of the First Folio, almost all from Folger copies, except for one variant page from Huntington and one from New York Public Library. The choice of “primary” pages follows Hinman, mostly, [but Peter Blayney made the final selection of] “best” copies to photograph. The pages are presented in high resolution color images, along with a selection of electronic texts including the

53 Peter S Donaldson, 'Digital Archive as Expanded Text: Shakespeare and Electronic Textuality', in Kathryn Sutherland, ed, Electronic Text (Oxford, 1998), 173-97 (173). This is an absorbing article, stretching from the conceptual (e.g. extending the definition of ‘text’) to the practical (e.g. illustrating the possibility of comparing simultaneously two film versions of selected and highlighted text).
54 Ibid, 184.
Oxford Electronic Edition [1989] (based on Wells and Taylor) and transcriptions of the Folio. Images are linked to text through a geometrical mapping. Each image can be zoomed in and juxtaposed with others. Each image is accompanied by a database entry that lists equivalents in Riverside pagination, TLN, signature...visible signing, library, copy number, and "thumbnail" images of any variants noted for the page. Clicking on these brings up the variant page.

The "digital facsimile" of the Folio is part of a larger structure which includes quartos—at present all copies of the *Hamlet* early Quartos and their accompanying e-texts; all Huntington early quartos have been digitally photographed and are being integrated into the structure. In addition, we have digitized 1500 works of art and illustration relevant to *Hamlet* and have likewise linked them to appropriate lines of text, as well as five complete *Hamlet* films. 55

Indicative of the accuracy of this facsimile is the following: 'Digital images were checked against slides and against Hinman for minor flaws (usually tiny hairs) and when these were found, slides were redigitized and re-checked. Records were kept of this process for every page'.

As Donaldson says in his article, there are 'substantial barriers' to immediate implementation of the project’s vision—'problems of institutional co-operation, copyright, video delivery, and others will take some time to resolve' (174-75). Encouragingly, in his letter he says: 'Initial plans are to make the entire Archive available, at first, at Folger, Huntington and MIT, and to make a small portion...available freely on the World Wide Web as an experiment in free distribution of linked primary materials... Our wish, of course, [subject to permissions] is that as large a fraction of this material can be released for as little cost as possible, to scholars, teachers and students. 56

55 Letter from Peter S Donaldson, 4 March 1998.
56 Also to be mentioned in the electronic field are:

- Anne Barton and John Kerrigan, Executive Editors, *Editions and Adaptations of Shakespeare A Full-Text Database of Major Historical Editions and Theatre Adaptations on CD-ROM and the World Wide Web*. [Cambridge:] Chadwyck-Healey, 1995. This is not not an attempt at a facsimile. The text is character-based (ie, keyed-in, not created through digital imaging), keyed in for the purpose. Its typeface is different and it does not preserve the First Folio's catchwords, double columns, signatures, or pagination (though page breaks are shown). In addition to other Shakespeare material, the CD-ROM contains eleven editions of Shakespeare from the First Folio to the Cambridge edition of 1863-66. The source copy for the First Folio was the Capell copy (West 4, Lee 3) in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge. [One] can search the text quickly and precisely within and across editions and display different versions simultaneously on screen. Full documentation for the encoding scheme is supplied to purchasers. (*Editions and Adaptations of Shakespeare: a brochure of Chadwyck-Healey Ltd (Cambridge, 1996), 2).

- James Saeger has reproduced *Lear* and *Hamlet* Folio pages... in color on the Web' at the University of Pennsylvania (Peter Donaldson, letter cited two notes above).
Facsimiles of Parts of the First Folio

The editions cited above are all the complete ones of which I am aware. Without an attempt at being exhaustive, the following gives eight examples of other facsimile printings.

1. The fourth item in a volume entitled ‘Choice Catalogues’ in the British Library is a specimen page (the first page of The Comedy of Errors, undated) of Booth’s (reduced) folio edition. It notes that ‘a full Prospectus and other Specimens can be had on application’ and quotes: ‘The work is progressing with “safest haste”—As You Like It.’ Whether it progressed as far as a published volume I have not discovered; nor have I seen a copy of the planned octavo edition or the planned edition of Pericles referred to in the advertisements in the Booth volume.

2. In 1893, Duncan C Dallas, the Dallastype Press, London, launched a facsimile in various formats, including parts (fifty-seven parts, each with sixteen pages, in three paper sizes) and single plays. Because the entry (1895) for Dallas, in Jaggard’s Bibliography, suggests the whole Folio was published and because Louis Marder stated that ‘the complete Folio was issued in 1895’, I present in some detail all that I have seen.

(a) Under one shelf-mark, the British Library has three folio volumes: Part I (Preliminaries), Part II (the first sixteen pages of The Tempest) and Part III (the last three pages of The Tempest and the first thirteen of Two Gentlemen of Verona). The title-pages of all three volumes read, in part:

The Dallastype Shakespeare, A Reduced Facsimile of the First Folio (1623) Edition, In the British Museum. Photographed from the Original by permission of the Trustees [1893]. [They state that the portrait is from the Grenville copy]

(b) Under another shelf-mark, the Library also has a folio volume containing the complete play of The Tempest (in a red morocco binding). It has no date of publication, but Jaggard (468) records it as 1893.

(c) Under a third shelf-mark, the Library has another copy of The Tempest. This edition has an introduction by Furnivall (four pages, double column). One of its features is two texts on facing pages (as described on the title-page quoted below). Another is the original music for Ariel’s two songs. The two songs were ‘composed by Robert Johnson, a contemporary of Shakespeare [and were] harmonised for three Voices by Dr. John Wilson, and Published by him in ‘Cheerfull Ayres or Ballads;’

---

57 Shelf-mark 11913.a.34 (4).
58 ‘First Folio Reproductions’ cited above, 33.
59 1.766.m.4.
60 The date is from Jaggard, Shakespeare Bibliography, 552.
61 1.764.m.12.
62 1.766.m.3.
Oxford, 1660. . . . The Music now given is Dallastype Facsimile from the Copy in the British Museum'. The following is the text of the title-page in full:

Double Text Dallastype Shakespeare The Tempest A Reduced Dallastype Facsimile of the Play from the First Folio (1623) Edition and Facing Each Page thereof the Modern Text as Determined by the Late Charles Knight Introduction by Dr. F. J. Furnivall with Portrait by Droeshout and Facsimiles of the Original Music Edited with Glossarial Index by Frederick A. Hyndman and D. C. Dallas London George Redway 1895.

There are Dallas advertisements bound in at the end of this volume including one which reads in part: 'In preparation To be published December 1895 uniform with the Present work The Merry Wives of Windsor Introduction by Dr. F. J. Furnivall'.

Dallas claims complete accuracy for his process: 'Dallastype reproduces type work in clear and accurate facsimile, and is . . . more reliable . . . than photolithography, photo-zincography, or photo-zincotype, which require numerous erasures and corrections. The Dallastype is the pure and untouched reproduction of the original text'. He quotes many authorities, including Dowden, Furnivall and Furness, in support of this claim.63

I have found no evidence that Dallas published more textual facsimiles than the three volumes in (a) above and the two editions of The Tempest in (b) and (c) above. It is not entirely clear whether Louis Marder's comment, 'Only a copy in BM is recorded in Jaggard' (33), refers to (a) above or to Jaggard's entry for Dallas in 1895, but it is quite clear that Jaggard's comment, 'A large paper copy is at the British Museum' (552), refers to (a). There is no such comment under his 1895 entry.

3. The 'Preliminary Matter' was reset and published with the catalogue for the First Folio tercentenary exhibition in Stationers' Hall: The Worshipful Company of Stationers and the Shakespeare Association, In Commemoration of the First Folio Tercentenary, a Resetting of the Preliminary Matter of the First Folio, with a Catalogue of Shakespeariana Exhibited in the Hall of the Company (Oxford, 1923).

4. A facsimile of The Tempest was sold in the USA in 1927-28. I owe all of the following to Louis Marder:64


The source copy is now at the University of California, Berkeley (West 45). Marder cites an advertisement showing that 'it was printed for American Baconiana and sold by then in 1927-8 for $1.50'. He said his copy had been used 'for Baconian research'.

---

63 Advertisement bound in at the end of The Tempest volume cited in (b) above.
64 'First Folio reproductions', 34.
5. In 1928, ten plays were issued in full-size facsimile, each in a separate volume. For each John Dover Wilson wrote a one- to two-page introduction and prepared a list of modern readings. The plays are *The Tempest, As You Like It, Twelfth Night, The Winter's Tale, Henry V, Coriolanus, Julius Caesar, Macbeth, King Lear, and Antony and Cleopatra*.\(^{65}\) They are based on the Grenville copy in the then British Museum. The First Folio pages are by photolithography, the rest of the volume by letterpress. The title-page of *The Tempest* reads in full:

The Tempest By William Shakespeare A Facsimile of the First Folio Text With an Introduction by J. Dover Wilson, Litt. D. and a List of Modern Readings London Printed at The Chiswick Press and published by Faber & Gwyer Limited at 24 Russell Square, W.C. [1928]

According to Karl J Holzknecht, Dover Wilson's 'enterprise was left incomplete by depression and war'.\(^{66}\)

6. In 1930, Bernard Quaritch, Ltd, offered all of the preliminary pages and the last page in facsimile, including the title-page in both the first and second state:\(^{67}\)

The First Folio Shakespeare. Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies. 1623. Facsimiles of the preliminary leaves and the last leaf . . . The greatest care has been taken in making these facsimiles, and only the finest impressions are offered. The paper has been specially handmade in close imitation of the original, so that they may be inserted in an imperfect copy of the First Folio without incongruity.

With commendable attention to customer requirements, four pairs of the preliminaries 'for convenience in stitching . . . can each be supplied in one sheet'. The prices ranged from £1/1/- (for each of πA1 and πA5) to £3/3/- (for each of the title-pages). Peter Blayney points out that the process used was photozincography and comments that the reproduced watermark is 'fairly good'.\(^{68}\)

7. The Scolar Press issued Hamlet in a 'convenient format': *William Shakespeare Hamlet The Text of the First Folio 1623* (Menston, England, 1969). It was reproduced from an original Folio in the British Library.\(^{69}\) Other than a one-page note concerning its reproduction, a table giving equivalent First Folio page numbers and act and scene divisions, a reproduction of the first page of *Hamlet* in the First Folio and its own page numbers, nothing has been added. The following is from the note:

---

\(^{65}\) All are in the British Library, shelf-mark 11768.f.4.\(^{66}\) 'Book Reviews', review of the Yale facsimile, *PBSA* 49 (1955), 190-95 (190).\(^{67}\) Bernard Quaritch, Ltd., *No. 436: A Catalogue of Books in English History and Literature from the Earliest Times to the End of the Seventeenth Century, Part II, K-Z* (1930).\(^{68}\) Peter W M Blayney, 'Fifteen First Folio Leaves in Photozincographic Facsimile' (Unpublished, March, 1993), 1-6 (6). He generously gave me a copy of this article, an analysis of twelve fake leaves (not the Quaritch leaves).\(^{69}\) The BL shelf-mark for the Scolar Press volume is X.950/129 and for the original from which it was reproduced C.39.i.12.
The following facsimile . . . represents an attempt to provide, in a convenient format, the only substantive text of the play without having to reduce photographically the size of the original type. In order to produce this 'quarto-like' appearance, the text has been cut up, with consequent loss of original headlines, catchwords and signatures. The text itself has not, however, been tampered with in any way, and though there is always a danger of destroying minute details (inherent in the very process of offset lithographic reprinting), every effort has been made to ensure that the facsimile is an accurate representation of the original as far as the printed text is concerned.

8. The last facsimile printing to be mentioned concerns only King Lear, but both Quarto and Folio versions and in two formats; they were prepared by Michael Warren and published by the University of California Press (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1989):

*The Parallel Lear 1608-1623*

*The Complete Lear 1608-1623*

The first contains a Preface (three pages), a General Introduction (eleven pages) and an Annotated Bibliography (eleven pages). It gives photographic facsimiles (in the invariant or uncorrected state) of the first Quarto and the Folio. These are placed in the inner columns of facing pages. In the outer columns, Warren gives the corrected states of the Quarto and the Folio. With the two texts and the two sets of corrections placed in this way, one can compare them with great ease. Both plays are given through-line-numbering. *The Complete Lear*—much more expensive than, and the price including a soft-bound copy of, *The Parallel Lear*—presents photographic facsimiles of both the Quartos and the Folio Lear on loose leaves. 'They] reproduce, firstly, an ideal copy of the formes in invariant and corrected states and, secondly, formes in uncorrected states . . . The materials appear to be scrupulously presented with the minimum of editorial interference'.

They are accompanied by booklets on the text.

---

70 I have been unable to locate a copy of The Complete Lear to examine and therefore rely on H R Woudhuysen, 'The Year's Contributions to Shakespeare Studies: Editions and Textual Studies', in Stanley Wells, ed, *Shakespeare Survey*, 44 (Cambridge, 1992), 255.
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- For copies without West numbers, see Foley, Forrest Home, Roorkee, Tomsk, Valladolid and Part V of the Census in Chapter 7.
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Adams, The Reverend Fulford, ii, 315
Alleyne, Edward, 158, 159
America, F1 in, 91. See also censuses of F1; and under auction houses; sales of F1, 19c and 20c
American demand, 5
American market and F1 traffic, 57
earliest American purchase, probably c. 1836
(22, Senate House), 34, 169
early collectors in America, 34
migration of copies to America, 290, 293
possible first F1 in America, 1820, 39
regret in UK over migration of copies, 47
American Art Association, 111, 113, 116, 117. See also auction houses
Anderson Galleries/Auction Co, 102, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 263, 315. See also auction houses and-1/n71 and 4/n91
Ashburnham Library, 179
Aspley, William, 8
auction and sales catalogues, 18c
auction/sales catalogues, 'virtually indistinguishable', 27
English books come first, theological/secular no distinction, 24
over 2,400 in 18c, one third 1780-1800, 24
retail sales catalogues become important, 26
auction and sales catalogues, 19c
BL lists nearly 6,000, 33, 34
peak years, 1850s and 1860s, 34
auction catalogues, 17c. See also under Davis, Richard
Davis’s catalogues, 1686-88, valuable information source, 21
do not recognise literature, treat F1 arbitrarily, 17
five extracts from, 16-17
Latin/folio/theology books come first, 17

---

B

Bacon, Francis
abaconian F1 owner, -n70, 48
Bacon, a Minshew subscriber, 9
Baconian controversy, 32
no evidence of owning F1, 17
Bangs & Co, 320
Bates, Dr William, 174
Bedford (binder), 108, 109, 112, 113, 114, 116, 118, 186, 259, 313
Belanger, Terry, future transfer of old books from academic libraries, 299
bibliographers
19c., See Bohn, Daniel, Dibdin, Hazlitt, Jaggard, Lowndes, Wheatley
20c, 43-45
Bibliographical Society, 42, -1/n139
bibliography. See new bibliography and F1's role in development of binding. See also costs to produce and distribute cost of, 8, 9
types of, 9
Blatchford, Mary Edgcumbe, 168. See also Lee's Census
Blayney, Peter W M, 11, 14, 141, 146, 152, 240, 241, 271, 276, 285, 292, 333, 334, 340. and see under reference notation, and Folger F1 Exhibition (1991), 46 challenges to Hinman-n9, 8
descriptions of Meisei 8 and 9, 155
edition size of F1-n9, 7
his F1 study, 45, 46. -1/n5
Introduction to Norton Facsimile, 2nd edn, 335
on costs to produce and distribute F1, 6-9
on Folger 49, 272
on Folger 80-82, 277, 279, 281
on Folger copies, 276
on notation on Folger 10 title-page-n19, 12
on notations in West 33 (Oriel)-n26, 14
reproduction of Dering's F1 purchase record-n18, 11
Blount, Edward, 8
Bodleian Library
Bodley on including plays in, 10
return of its original F1 (1906), 109
sale of its original F1, 15
Bodley, Thomas. See Bodleian Library
Bohn, Henry George, 33. See also under FI census makers
book auctions. See entries starting with auction
book sales in 18c and 19c. See world of book sales, 18c and 19c
bookellers, who specialised in F1, 52
Booth, Lionel, 173, 177. See also under facsimile editions of F1
Boswell, James (the younger), 31
F1 owner, 32, 165
Bowden (bookseller), 195
Bowers, Fredson
critique of Yale facsimile of F1, 332
on Booth's facsimile of F1, 326
on facsimile processes. See-App/n38
on Lee's Facsimile of F1, 326
British Columbia, University of, loan copy returned to the Folger, 300
Buxton, John, 13
—C—
Capell, Edward, 24, 27, 29, 60. -1/nn 62 and 70
F1 owner, 25
Greg's description of his F1, 25
his library, 25
Cartwright, William, 12, 159. See also under publication price of F1 and-1/n23 and-3/n6
Castiglione & Scott, 321
censuses of F1. See also Lee's Census
in America, 1876 and 1888, 33, 35
centennial of F1, 1923
exhibitions, Cardiff, Southwark, British Museum, 46
Old Vic culminated ten years of performing all plays, 47
publication of Gollancz and other studies, 46. -1/n159
resetting of F1 preliminary leaves, 47
Charles I's F2, 15, 85
Cherry-Garrard, Apsley, 196
Christie's, vi, 106, 108, 111, 112, 113, 115, 121, 122, 123, 193, 195, 212, 213, 225, 226, 228. See also auction houses important channel for F1, 20c, 52
classes of F1 (according to condition), Sidney Lee's, 286
Cole, Peter (printer), 174, 175
collational formula for F1. See reference notation for F1
collectors, of books. See also Durning-Lawrence, Folger, Halliwell-Phillipps, Houghton, Huntington, Lennox, Morgan, Perry, Pforzheimer, Philipps, Prinzel, Roxburgh, Sterling
American collectors, 34, 54
Collier, John Payne, 31, 217. -1/n263
Colman, D M, 199
comparison of F1 price to cost of household items, 1629, 14
comparison of F1 prices. See also price indexes
comparison of F1 to F2-4, 17c (early). See also records of F1 in 17c, few early
F2 18/6 (1637), 22/- (1638), 14
comparison of F1 to F2-4, 17c (late)
comparative prices, 20, 69-71
F1 'obsolete', 15
F2-4 apparently better, 22
F3, £1/8/6 (1678) outdoes F1, 20
F4, seven additional plays, 20
comparison of F1 to F2-4, 18c
comparative prices, 87-88
early 18c, F4 regarded as 'best' edition, 29
first half 18c, little firm data, 28
second half, F2-4 prices do not match rise in F1 prices, 30
comparison of F1 to F2-4, 19c
comparative prices, 39, 98
F1 in a price-class apart from the others, but rarity value of F3 recognised, 39
premium for F1 over F2 and F4 increased, over F3 decreased, since 18c, 40
sales of F2-4, (representative), 98
comparison of F1 to F2-4, 20c
comparative prices, 55, 128-29
pattern of sales of F2-4 broadly similar to that of F1, 55
prices of F2-4 from 1980/81, all in £000s, 55
comparison of prices. See also price analysis (trends)
meaning and limitations, 18-19
comparison of prices, F1 to folios of others. See also Gutenberg Bible
17c, prices of others' folios, 21, 72-73
18c, F1 commanded premium prices despite condition, 30
18c, prices of others' folios, 1732-70, 30
19c, 1812, £2,600 (Boccaccio), £1,060 (Caxton), 35
19c, 1890s, few books competed at F1's level of £1,000, 40
19c, prices of others' folios, 40
20c, 1980s-90s, folios of Jonson, Raleigh, Daniel occasionally top £1,000, F1 averages £270,000, 55
20c, Jonson/Shakespeare first editions, price multiple over 400, 56
20c, prices of others' folios, 55
Condell, Elizabeth, wife of Henry-n23, 13
Condell, Henry. See Heminge and Condell
Congreve, William, 17, 212. See also West 210
(Congreve)
Cooper, William (bookseller), 16, 21
catalogue with list of libraries sold 1676-87-n33, 15
Copernicus, De Revolutionibus, and Audubon, elephant folios, among few books with a
census-nl37, 41
costs to produce and distribute, 5, 6
as percent of price, 6, 7
Blayney corrections, 6, -1/n6
mark-ups on cost, 7, 8
of an average Jacobean book, 6, 7
of F1, 8
relationships of cost elements, 6, 7, 8
Culpeper, Nicholas, 174

— D —
Dallas, Duncan C
former owner of West 223, 316
on Dallastype facsimile, 342
on photo-zincotype facsimile, 327
Daniel, George. See also sales of F1, 19c; West 62
Elizabethan and Shakespearean library, 35
sale, 1864, 32, 35, 39, 60, 61
Daniel, P A (bibliographer), 32
Davis, Richard (bookseller). See also under
auction catalogues
bought Bodleian copy, 14
extracts from his 1686-88 catalogues, 71-73
sales of his stock, 21, 1/n44
De Ricci, Seymour, 33, 35, 59, 63, 110, 112, 113, 116, 228, 271. See also under F1 census
makers
defective copies of F1. See under F1 fragments
Dering, Sir Edward, Surrenden Hall, Kent, 59. See also West 97 (Padua)
purchased two F1s, December 1623, 11
Shakespeare performances at Surrenden-n18, 11
descriptions of copies of F1
differences between UK and Japanese
descriptions, 155
Japanese copies, 187-214
model for describing copies, v. and see
Chapter 2
need for a world-wide project, iv
UK copies, 156-86
Dibdin, Thomas Frognall, 33. See also under F1
census makers
display and exhibitions of F1, 20c, 382. See also
centennial of F1, 1923
Folger Library, 1991, 46
Grolier Club, 1903 and 1916, 45
Lilly Library, Indiana, 1963, 46
National Portrait Gallery, 1964, 46
on permanent display, British Library and
Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, 45
Philadelphia, 1916 (Rosenbach), 45
Victoria and Albert Museum, 1916, 45
Donne, John, 158, 232. -1/n11
Donne, a Minshew subscriber, 9
no evidence of owning any Shakespeare-n11, 9
shares Droeshout as portraitist-n11, 9
drama, attitude towards in early 17c. See plays and
drama in early 17c
Droeshout portrait, 47. -1/n11 and 166
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin (collector) and
Lady, 171
Dyce, Alexander, 31, 32

— E —
editing and owning F1, 5
17c, no connection yet, 17
18c, most major editors owned F1, 25
19c, tradition continued till Furness, 32
20c, no scholar seems to have been an owner,
46
edition of F1, size-of-n9, 7
editions of Shakespeare, 18c, 23, 27, 29
editions of Shakespeare, 19c, 31, 32
editors of Shakespeare, 18c
Rowe, Pope, Theobald, Hamner, Warburton,
Johnson, Capell, Steevens, Malone, Reed,
22-29
editors of Shakespeare, 19c
Bowdler, Knight, Collier, Hallie-Philippes, Dyce, Craig, 31
Delius, 31
Furness, 32
Eyre and Spottiswoode (binder), 211

— F —
F1. See also entries starting with comparison of
F1, comparison of prices, costs to produce,
cross-references, descriptions of copies, display and exhibitions, editing and owning,
edition of F1 (size of), facsimile editions,
fascimiles of parts, Folger's F1 purchasing,
measurements of, new bibliography, owners,
ownership, price indexes, prices of,
publishers of, rates of sale, records of (17c), refurbishment of copies,
reference notation, sales of, scholars of,
textual primacy, unfound and untraced copies,
West, world of (20c)
F1 census makers. See also Lee's Census
Allibone, S Austin, 1870, 216
Bohn, Henry G, 1864, 216
De Ricci, Seymour, pre-1932, 222
Dibdin, Thomas Frognall, 1824, 216
Fleming, William H, 1888, 217
Ingleby, Holcombe, 1897, 217
Lindes, William Thomas, 1825, 1834, 216
Ottow, Harold, 1990, 223
Rodd, Thomas, pre-1864, 216
Smith, Robert Metcalf, 1927, 222
Winsor, Justin, 1874, 1876, 216

F1 copies. See also copies included and copies excluded under F1, new census
'non-Lee' and 'non-Lee?', 301
14 in Lee's Class 1A, all in institutions, 289
70 recorded since 1902, 293
distribution 1902 according to condition
(Lee's classes), 288–89, 295
distribution 1902 according to geography and
public/private mix, 289, 296
distribution in Lee's Census (table), 287
geographic movement 1902–98, 292–94
high number survived, 294
high proportion in good condition, 289, 294
Lee numbers/West numbers, concordance,
302–4
Lee's classes (according to condition), 286
Lee's inconsistent totals, 297
number and distribution, 1998, 293
number recorded by Lee by 1925, 288
number recorded by Lee in Census (158), 285,
287
shift in public/private mix 1902/98, 292–94
unfound. See unfound copies of F1
untraced. See untraced copies of F1
F1 fragments, 273
defective copies, 124
F1's 20c role, general examples. See also world of
F1, 20c
cited as evidence of Marlowe's F1 authorship,
48
Droeshout portrait, 47
effect of retaining Carysfort F1 in UK, 47
Geoffrey Grigson poem, 48
primary text for twenty-eight plays in Oxford
edition, 48
Punch cartoon, 47
Rosenbach's boat, 'First Folio II', 47
sculpture of, on statue, 47. See also plate 4

F1, individual copies. See introduction to index,
unfound and untraced copies
F1, issues of
three issues, 139
Troilus's Prologue defines third issue, 139
F1, length of time in
one library, 176
public library, 176
F1, new census, 304, 305–22
venues for further research-n51, 229
copies excluded, 300
copies included, 299–300
definition of 'unfound', 313
definition of 'unfound' and 'untraced', 275
definition of 'untraced', 319
highlighting of unfound, untraced and lost
copies, 301
need for, 298–99
F1, preparing the new census
'comparison table' defined, 256

comparison tables to identify elusive copies,
234, 236, 256–65
privacy and security for private owners, 224,
249
questionnaires for copy information, 224,
250 and see 4/n47
record of F1 sales in 20c (Table W), 225
the search for copies, 223–37
F1, relative rarity, 35, 40, 53, 56, 67
F1, relatively unrefurbished copies described, 142
West 18 (Dulwich), 156
West 27 (Dr Williams's), 171
West 38 (Wheler), 180
F1, UK copies described with all text leaves, 142
West 21 (Soane), 163
West 22 (Senate House), 167
West 23 (Durning-Lawrence), 169
West 27 (Dr Williams's), 171
West 37 (Ashburnham), 178
West 39 (Theatre), 183
F1-4 as a package, 5. See also prices of F1-4
together
18c, no evidence of demand for, 30
19c, by 1824, being regarded as a package, 39
20c, a custom to sell and buy as a set, 55
20c, record of thirty-four sales, 130. -1/n148
price of F1 taken as 56% of package price, 125
F1s, what to count as a copy
condition of leaves and text, 275
Folger 80–82, 281–83
known location, 275
Lee number and Folger number, 271
copies with original leaves, 273
original leaves originally from same copy, 274
owner's decision, 275
summary table of considerations, 280
table of comparison, Folger 80, 81, 82, 278
whether bound and whether bound in one
volume, 273
facsimile editions. See also under facsimile
processes; Greg; Taylor
to assess, need to know editor's choices, 324
facsimile editions of F1. See also under Bowers;
F1, world of, 20c; Hinman; Prouty and see
Lee's Facsimile Introduction
19c, five editions, from 1807, 36
20c, ten editions, 46
Applause (1995), 334
Arden CD-ROM (1997), 323, 337
Booth (1804), 325
digital (MIT), 323, 339
facsimile of choice, Norton 2nd edn, 323
formats, 324
Halliwell-Phillipps (1876), 327. See also
under Hinman, Charlton
Lee (1902), 329
meeting scholars' and editors' needs, 33, 46
Methuen (1910), 330
National (1888–89), 328
Norton (1968), with introduction by Charlton
Hinman, 333
Norton, 2nd edn, with Introductions by
Charlton Hinman and Peter Blayney, 335
other in electronic field-App/n55, 340
reasons for their being in demand, 324
Routledge (1997), 336
Staunton (1866), 327
summary table with dates, 323
Wright (1807-08), 325
Yale (Kôkeritz) (1955), 331
facsimile editions of F2-4
Methuen (1904-09), 323, 331
Routledge, 337
facsimile editions of F2-4
Methuen (1904-09), 323, 331
Routledge, 337
facsimile pages. See under refurbishment of copies
facsimile processes
collotype. See-App/n26
collotype and offset. See-App/n38
Dallastype, 342
photolithography vs collotype, 330
photo-zincotype, 327
facsimiles of parts of F1
of a specimen page (Booth), 341
of Hamlet (Scolar Press), 343
of individual leaves (1930), 343
of King Lear (Parallel Lear and The Complete Lear), 344
of ten plays, ed J Dover Wilson, 343
of the original music for Ariel's songs, 341
of the Preliminaries (Stationers' Company), 342
of The Tempest, 342
of The Tempest and Two Gentlemen (Dallas), 341
Farrar, Donald, 227, 232, 240, 320
new Folger F1 catalogue, 276
Finly, Mme Ugo, 197, 237
Fleming, John F (bookseller), 120, 121, 122, 197, 200, 202, 204, 206, 209, 261
important F1 bookseller, 52
Fleming, W H, 219, 223. See also under census makers
Fletcher, H M (bookseller), 214
Flower, Charles Edward, 186
Foley copy, 113, 229, 241, 262, 291, 292, 321
Folger 80-82. See -1/n173 and Chapter 5, Section B
Folger F1 catalogue (RLIN), 102, 276
Folger First Folios, iv. See also Folger's F1 purchasing and prices paid
Folger Shakespeare Library, 271
F1 collection, eighty-two copies, has no rival, 48. -1/n173
F1 exhibition, 1991, 46. -1/n3
number of FIs, 276-79
role in studies of F1, eg, Hinman's, 48
world centre for renaissance literary studies, 49
Folger's F1 purchasing and prices paid, 48. See also Appendix S/P 11, Table V; and under Mayhew, A H; West SB (Vincent)
1890s, bought four FIs, 35
Folger price list, 49, 102, 124. and see List of Cue Titles and-1/n270-89 passim
graphic picture of purchases, Chart 1, 58
methods of purchasing and effect on price, 49-51
price paid and date purchased, each copy, 125-26
prices paid, average by decade, 50
record prices paid, 63
steady purchasing 1893-1928, 49
Folger, Henry Clay, ii, 5, 55, 56, 109, 124, 171, 263, 316, 317. and see under Lee Sidney and Folger's F1 purchasing and prices paid both he and Emily, familiar with Shakespeare scholarship, 42
letter to A H Mayhew, 49, 50
non-response to Lee's F1 enquiries, 219
numbers he assigned to his copies, 272, 276, 277
purchase of Folger 80, 281
purchase of Folger 82, 283
Forrest Home copy (Lee 145), 34, 229, 272, 273, 275, 291, 300
Frankfurt Fair, 1623 and 1625. See under records of F1 in 17c, few early
Freeman, Arthur and Janet Ing, 321
Furness, Horace Howard, 32
Garden set, F1-4. See West 175 (Garden)
Garrick, David, 23, 28, 282
F1 owner, 39, 76, 78
Gondomar copy. See Valladolid copy
Greg, W W, v, 11, 42, 43, 45, 106, 138, 220, 324, 332. See also under Pollard, Greg and McKerrow; Lee's Census; reference notation for F1; and see-1/n9, 71, 139, 143, 147, 149 and 159
Gutenberg Bible. See also Chart 5 and under price indexes
1793, sold for £100, 30
1873-1900, sold for £500-£4,000, 40
1884 sale, Gutenberg £3,900, F1 £590, 40
20c prices, 56
censuses of-1/n37, 41
compared to F1 for distinction, 41, 66
F1 prices compared to Gutenberg prices, 30, 40, 56

-G-

Halle, Frederick McDonald and R C, 197
Halliwell-Phillipps, James O, 31, 32, 33, 36, 46, 182, 186, 204, 217. See also under facsimile editions of F1 and sales of F1, 18c
Hammer, Thomas, 27
F1 owner, 25
Hayday (binder), 169
Hayes (binder), 121, 190, 268
Heslitt, W Carew, 48
Henslowe, Philip, 158
Herford F1-n29, 14
Heritage (bookseller), 224
Hinman, Charles, iv, 45, 48, 146, 271, 285, 298, 328. -1/n9 and 147 and see under reference notation for F1 and Norton Facsimile, 323
challenges to, by Blayney and McKenzie-n9, 8
his F1 discoveries, 48
his study of F1, a model, 45, 48
Introduction to Norton Facsimile, 333
on Folger 80-82, 277
on Folger copies, 276
on Halliwell-Phillipps's facsimile of F1, 328
on Lee's Facsimile of F1, 330
on Yale facsimile of F1, 332
histoire du livre, 5
Hoe, Robert (collector). See also West 64 (Hoe, Folger 7) and 1-n281
sale (1911) two FIs, 52, 111. 1-n181
Houghton, Arthur Amory (collector), 193
Howe, Richard George Penn, 4th Earl Howe, 202
Howell, John (bookseller), 196
Huntington, Henry (collector), 41, 50, 55, 112
Huygens, Sir Constantin[e], 232. 1-n235

—I—
index, indexes (price). See price indexes
inflation, 37, 53, 60. See also price indexes
taking account of, 57
Ireland, William Henry, forgeries, 23

—J—
Jaggard, Isaac (son of William), 8
Jaggard, William (bibliographer), 12, 13
Jaggard, William (printer), 43
probably did printing at cost, 8
publisher's mark-up, 8
Japan, copies of F1 in, 187-214
15 since 1969, 293
first in 1969, 213
Johnson, Dr Samuel, 23, 27, 28, 29, 60, 80, 85.
1-n84
and textual primacy of F1, 24
anomalies concerning his ownership of
Folios-n232, 80
F1 owner, 25
his library, 25

—K—
Kean, Edmund
F1 presented to him, NYC, 1820, 39, 169
owned F1 and F4, 39
sale of his F1, 92
Kemble, John Philip, 165
Ker, John (collector). See Roxburghe, Duke of
Killigrew, Charles, 212
Knight, Charles, 31, 32
Kraus, H P (bookseller), 188, 224, 264, 315, 316

—L—
Lakin, James, 196
Landau, Horace de, 197, 237
Lauderdale, Duke of. See Maitland, John
Lee numbers/West numbers, concordance, 302-4
Lee's Census
copies of—Lee's, Greg's, etc, 226
Lee's Census, iv, 17, 36, 49, 51, 56, 74, 90,
102, 107, 218-21. See also F1 copies
copies of Lee's, Greg's, etc, 106
effect of on sales activity of F1, 51
first attempt to list all copies, 41, 218
his 1906 and 1923 additions, 221, 287-88
his copy numbers changed to arabic-n5, vii
his questionnaire seeking information, 218,
244
Introduction, 33, 34
its value and its weaknesses, 220-21
Mary Edgcumbe Blatchford's help in USA, 197
reactions to it in New York, 220-21. 4/n24
simultaneously published with his Facsimile,
1902, 41
Lee's Facsimile Introduction. See also under
facsimile editions of F1
'revolution in English textual criticism
provoked' by it, 43
Greg's critique of it, Library (1903), first
'serious challenge' to Lee's authority, 43
Greg's judgement of it, 'rubbish', etc, 43
pivot between old and new bibliography, 42
Pollard's Shakespeare's Folios and Quartos
written in reply to it, 43
Lee, Sidney, 27, 38, 39, 40, 45, 50, 56, 57, 59,
76, 271. See also Lee's Census; Lee's
Facsimile Introduction; Lee, Sir Sidney,
Collection
'monopoly' on Shakespeare, 41. 1-n136
and a made-up copy of F1, 274
considerable achievement of his Census, 216
failure to give sources, 14, 28
favoured public ownership of F1, regretted
exodus to USA, 290
his 'pessimism', judgements on F1 printing,
challenged, 42
his Life of Shakespeare, 1898, went through
sixteen editions, 41
his reputation, 43
his treatment of F1 prices-n201, 57
inconsistencies, 12
persistence in seeking F1 information from
Folger, 219
represented 19c Shakespearean scholarship,
42
Lee, Sir Sidney, Collection
in Birthplace Trust Records Office, Stratford,
168, 218. 2/n18
Leighton (binder), 111
Lenox, James (collector), 55
Lewis, C (binder), 110, 114, 117
libraries
17c, five examples of sale of, 1687-99, 15
17c, seventy-four sales of, 1676-87, 15
18c, formation of, private and public, 25
18c, libraries of Capell, Johnston, Steevens,
Malone, Reed, 25
19c, sale of great libraries, especially
Shakespeare libraries, 33
19c, late 1880s, scarcity of F1 due to demand
from libraries, 36
19c, sales of Steevens's and Reed's libraries,
35
Roxburghe (1812), 'finest' auctioned till then,
35
Shakespeare collections to libraries, 25, 32
Lilly, Joseph (bookseller), 36
handled nearly forty FIs, 1831-70, 34
London, University of, F1 owner, 168, 171
Lowndes, William Thomas, 33. See also under F1 census makers
Lyttelton, John Cavendish, Viscount Cobham, 210

—M—
Maclehose (binder), 120
Madden, Samuel, DD, 185
Maggs Bros (booksellers), 46, 54, 104, 109, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 197, 281
important F1 bookseller, 52
Maitland, John, Duke of Lauderdale, 16. l/n37
Malone, Edmond, 15, 27, 31, 121
F1 owner, 25
his library, 25
reply to Ireland's 'Shakespearean manuscripts', 23
Malone Society-n139, 42
market representative data, defined. See under price analysis (trends)
Maruzen (booksellers), 188, 264
Maurice, A (bookseller), 316
-1/n176 and 294
Folger letter to, objecting to price, 50
Folger's solicitation of F1 copies, 49
McKerrow, R B, 42. See also Pollard, Greg and McKerrow and-
1/n133
Meames (binders), sale of Charles Meame's F4, 1687-n222, 70
measurements of F1, 140-41
maximum possible leaf size, 141
of binding, 141, 192
of leaf, 140
Meisei University, 17, 46, 48, 55, 121, 122, 123, 234, 272. See also Plate 1
F1 collection formed since 1975, 48, 190
has four F1-4s, 190
in 1991, had 22 F2s, 20 F3s and 22 F4s, 190
second largest collection of F1s (twelve), 48, 190
summary of F1 collection, with references, 191
Millington, Edward (bookseller), 16, 21
Milton, John, a possible F1 owner-n40, 17
Minsheu, John, subscription list, 1617, 9
model for describing copies of F1
definition of 'model', 141
elements of descriptions, 143-48
F1s consulted to develop model, 142
outline of model, 143
text and provenance privileged, 141
Montgomery, Earl of
F1 dedicatee and Minsheu subscriber, 9
Morgan, J P (collector), 50, 55, 188

—N—
Nant, Nello (binder), 188
new bibliography
an example, almost inconceivable Jaggard
shared printing, 42
Hinman's study a model. See under Hinman,
Cheltenham
list of thirty-five 20c works on F1, -1/n148
nine F1 studies illustrating central path of
Anglo-American bibliography, 43
observed fact and analysis versus
impressionistic speculation, 42
painstaking observation, careful analysis and
superior knowledge, 42
new bibliography, F1's role in development of,
5, 41-45. See also Pollard, Greg and
McKerrow
F1, focus of scholarly drama, 41
Folger collection key. See under Folger
Shakespeare Library
Hinman's discoveries. See Hinman, Charlton
Lee's Facsimile Introduction a trigger. See
Lee's Facsimile Introduction
prefiguring of role at Bibliographical Society,
1898, 42
New Shakespeare Society, 160
Non-Conformism and F1, 174-77
number of F1 copies. See under F1 copies
Nursery Folio, 282

—O—
Orrock (binder), 111
Osbourne, Thomas, Duke of Leeds, 212
Otness, Harold M, 74, 78, 79, 93, 130, 176,
224, 225, 227, 232, 233, 236, 239, 314,
319. See also under F1 census makers
owners. See also editing and owning
17c, owners (vendors), 17. -1/n29 for records
in Lee, Census
18c, owners (vendors), 28
19c, actors, 39
19c, American, 34
19c, owners (vendors), 39
19c, shift to institutions, 38
19c-20c, Americans become principal buyers,
54
20c, major shift from private to institutional,
55
20c, sellers and buyers, 54
many F1s come from titled English families,
17, 28, 54
ownership of F1. 5. See under F1 copies and
America, F1 in. See 6/n14 for definition of
'public' & 'private'
ownership of F1, no evidence of
among leading writers, 17c, 17
among leading writers, 18c, 28
among leading writers, 19c, 39

—P—
paper, 7, 8, 14, 23
Parke-Bernet, 117, 118, 119, 120. See also
auction houses
Payne, Roger (binder), 26, 80, 108, 110, 111,
113, 114, 118, 257. See also West 68 (Folger
11)
Payne, Thomas (bookseller), 29, 78, 80, 82, 85.
-1/n245
extracts from catalogue, 1758, 75
Pearson, R C (bookseller), 213
Pease, Howard, 195
Perry, Marsden (collector), 34, 50, 55, 109, 183.
-1/nn78 and 102
Pforzheimer, Carl (collector), 55
Phillipps, Sir Thomas (collector), 198
Pickering (bookseller), 197
plays and drama in early 17c, attitude towards
excluded from library catalogues, etc, 10
general attitude, 10
Thomas Bodley's, 10
treatment in auction catalogues, 17
Pollard, A W, 42, 43, 47, 138, 220. See also
Pollard, Greg and McKerrow and-Hxm9, 139,
and 141
on photolithography & collotype in
facsimiles, 330
Pollard, Greg and McKerrow. See also under Lee's
Facsimile Introduction
and the new bibliography, 42
their impact illustrated in Bibliographical
Society and Malone Society-n139, 42
Pope, Alexander, 22, 25, 27
his library-n78, 26,
possibly an F I owner, but see-n73, 25
Pratt (binder), 109, 111, 116, 118, 119, 265
preliminaries of F I, order of, 138
press-variants, iv, 43, 155. See also under
Westerne
given in descriptions of F I, 145, 152-53
need to collate all copies of F I, 298
variant pages illustrated in Norton Facsimile,
333
price analysis (trends)
'autocorrelation', definition of (by De Ricci),
59
'market representative data', definition of, 57
 autocorrelation (Wheatley), 60
Class I FIs, homogeneity of price series, 57,
61
economic history, as source for price theory
and statistics on, 57
homogeneity in price series, 57, 66
time spans for, 58, 59, 60, 61
price and sales information. See sales and price
information, sources
price indexes
F I compared to bread 1623 to 1900s, 59-60
F I compared to consumer price index (CPI)
1790s-1850s, 61
F I compared to consumer price index (CPI)
1860s-1970s, 61
F I compared to Gutenberg Bible 1793-1978,
66-67
F I compared to luxury items, 20c, 63-65
F I compared to works of art 1760-1960, 65-
66
use of British statistics, 57
price of publication. See publication price of F I
prices of F I. See also comparison of F I to F2-4;
comparison of prices, F I to folios of others,
for each century; and prices of F I, long-term
trends
characteristics of buyers, causing rise, 64, 65
forces (other than inflation) causing rise, 60
relationship to purchasing power, 5. See also
inflation; price indexes
prices of F I, 17c (late), 18-20, 58. See also under
prices of F I, long-term trends
14/- (1687/88), 18/- (1699), 18
no record till 1687/88, 14
Shakespeare only holding his own, 21
prices of F I, 18c, 28-30. See also under prices of
F I, long-term trends
'the most expensive book in our language', 29
average price, 1790s, £30, 31
compared to price of contemporary
Shakespeare editions, 29
figures in table, 87-88
high prices paid by Roxburghe and Jennings,
29
late 1780s, price take-off, 29
little firm data till late 18c, 28, 58, 59
sales price, offer price, 26-27
second half, none less than 3 guineas, 29
prices of F I, 19c, 37-38. See also under prices of
F I, class I; prices of F I, long-term trends
1890s, average price £410, 40
1899, 'fine copy worth at least £1,000', 38
1899, first of four figures, £1,700, 38
average price by decade, 38
average, first half £47, second half £249, 38
by end of century, American demand put
pressure on, 35
figures in tables, 38, 39, 91-96
high price paid at Daniel sale, 1864, £716/2/-,
32, 35
increased in each decade, except 1830s, 40
prices of F I, 20c, 52-54. See also under prices of
F I, Class I; Folger F I purchasing and prices
paid; prices of F I, long-term trends
average prices by decade, 52, 53-54
average, last decade and half, £1/4 million
plus, 56
figures in tables, 53, 102-5, 125-26
fragments attracting high prices, 54
record price £691,000 (1989), portion of price
for Garden set, 53. and see West 175
took off 1960s, shot up 1980s, 53
prices of F I, Class I, figures in tables. See also
under prices of F I, long-term trends
19c, 38, 97
20c, 54, 12, 17
prices of F I, long-term trends. 5. See also under
price indexes and see Charts 2-5
'market representative data' (qv), 59, 60
1623-late 18c, inadequate data for solid
generalisations, 58
1623-mid-18c, probably sold mostly below
publication price, 59
average growth rates, 1790s-1850s, 60
average growth rates, 1890s-1990s, 61
average price by decade 1790s-1850s, 60-61
average price by decade 1860s-1970s, 61
FIs and Gutenberg Bibles, 66-67
individual prices (Class I and II-IV) 1790-
1862, 61
new record prices, 62-63
premium paid for Class I FIs, 61, 62
statistical methods used to construct Charts 2-
4-n208, 61
prices of F1-4 together. See also F1-4 as a package
18c, in same catalogue, 88
19c, as a package, 39
19c, when in the same sale, 101
20c, as a package, 130
20c, record £1.23 million, Garden set 1989, 55

prices of F2-4, 5. See also comparison of F1 to F2-4 for each century
prices of other writers' folios, 5. See also
comparison of prices, F1 to folios of others printer of F1. See Jaggar, William
printing cost. See costs to produce and distribute
Prinzmetal, Dr Myron (collector), 204
production costs. See costs to produce and distribute
Prouty, Charles Tyler
on Lee's Facsimile of F1, 330
publication price of F1
15- on Folger 71 flyleaf, 11
15- to £1, depending on binding, 58
confirmation of £1-n10, 9
George Steevens's statements, 12
note on Folger 10, 12
Sir Edward Dering, 1623, paid £2 for two, 11
William Cartwright's possible statement, 13
publishers of F1, the Jaggards, Blount, Smethwick and Aspley, 8

—Q—
Quaritch, Bernard (bookseller), 35, 47, 50, 102, 106, 108, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 121, 122, 123, 193, 194, 210, 213, 221, 224, 228, 290, 313, 319
gloss on Folger 9 and 13-n284, 104
handled about fifty F1s, 1847-99, 34
handled at least fifty F1s, 20c, 52
offer of facsimile leaves, 343
quartos. See under Shakespeare

—R—
rates of sale, F1, F2, F3, F4
18c, 27, 28, 30
19c, 37
20c, 51
records of F1 in 17c, few early
earliest advertisement, Frankfurt 1623, 11
exclusion from library catalogues, 10
no mention of Shakespeare in Cambridge library inventories, 9
no Shakespeare Folio bequests by 135 theatre persons-n23, 13
paucity of F1 traffic as one reason, 15
Reed, Isaac, 23, 25, 29, 31, 81, 165. -1/n259
F1 owner, 32
his library, 25, 35
reference notation for F1, 137-39
Charlon Hinman's, 137
Peter W M Blayney's, 138-39
W W Greg's, 137
refurbishment of copies of F1, 25
18c, example of Roger Payne's work, and bill, 26
18c, Steevens's comments, 1793, 26
19c, John Harris's 'perfect' facsimile pages, 36
19c, leaves to supply imperfections, 36
19c, Lilly had nearly twenty copies making up, 36
20c, Quaritch offer of facsimile leaves, 343
Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN). See Folger F1 catalogue (RLIN)
research methods and sources for sales and prices.
See introductions to the appendixes in Chap I
Richmond, George H (bookseller), 188
ring or knock-out among booksellers, 37, 62
Rivièrè (binder), 54, 111, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 119, 120, 121, 171, 197, 206, 214, 235, 261, 262, 269, 320
Robinson (booksellers), 197, 235. and see -/n65
Roorkee 'copy', 230, 288, 300
Rosenbach Museum & Library, 228, 232, 316
important F1 bookseller, 52
the priorities of F1 collectors-n189, 52
Rowe, Nicholas, 24, 25, 27, 28, 83
based 1709 edition on F4, 22
Roxburghe, Duke of, (collector), 81. See also under prices of F1, 18c; sales of F1, 19c and world of book sales, 19c
his F1 purchase, 1790, 29, 60
Roxburghe Club, 33
Roxburghe sale, 1812, 33, 35, 37, 39
R[oberts], R[obert], 1897, 217

—S—
Sabin (bookseller), 313
sales and price information, sources. See also introductions of and footnotes to the appendixes
17c (late), auction catalogues, 5
18c, auction and sales catalogues and contemporary comments, 5
19c, Lee's Census and auctioneers' catalogues, 5
20c, auctioneers' catalogues, BAR, ABPC, Rosenbach Biography, 6
sales of F1, 17c, 15-17. See also under Bodleian Library
late 17c, F1 selling less often than others' folios, 18
records of five sales 1687-99, 16-17
records, 1623-c. 1660, in Lee, Census, 14
sales of F1, 18c, 26-28
1781, F1 highlighted on catalogue title-page, 29. See also Plate 2
28 total in 18c, 27
demand of collectors and scholars, 25
texample of enthusiastic purchasing-n96, 32
Halliwell-Phillipps, influence on fortunes of F1, 33
number of sales by decade, 27
record of sales (table), 77-82
took off slowly, 27
sales of F1, 19c, 35
116 total in 19c, 36

beginning of American demand from 1830s, 34
F1 indispensable to early American collectors, 34
number of sales by decade, 37
one of the most sought-after and prestigious of collectables, 41
record of sales (table), 90–96
Roxburghe (1812), Daniel (1864), most influential sales, 35
sales of F1, 20c, 48–51
from 1960s, 15 copies to Japan, 55
number of sales by decade, 51
decades of peak sales, 1900s–1920s, 51
principal buyers, American, 54
record of sales (table), 108–23
shift from private to institutional, 55
years of peak sales (1922, etc), 51
sales of F1, long-term trend, 1740s–1990s, 57.
and see Chart 1, 58
sales, rates of. See rates of sales, F1, F2, F3, F4
Sanford (binder), 316
Sawyer, Charles J (bookseller), 321
Schoenbaum, S, 221
scholars, of Shakespeare, of F1.
See bibliographers: bibliographers, 20c; editors of Shakespeare, 18c and 19c
Scott, The Reverend John, 16. -/n3 5
Shakespeare. See also world of Shakespeare, 17c, 18c, 19c
'cultural presence', 5, 23
attitude towards his plays, 17c, 21, 177
his most read plays in 17c, 14
quartos, 10, 43, 51, 56 -/n 63, 66, 140 and -7/n3
Smethwick, John, 8
Smith, George D (bookseller), 320
Soane, Sir John, 166
principal channel for F1 since 18c, 52
Soheran, Henry (bookseller), 170, 179, 224, 265, 317
sources of information. See sales and price information, sources
St Andrews, University of, loan copy returned to the Folger, 299
Staggemeier & Welsher (binder), 119, 196
Stamper, H (binder), 266
Stationers' Company
1598 ordinance, 7
catalogues, 1622–26, 11
displaying F1 at tercentenary, 46
F1 wholesale price to, 8
Steevens, George, 15, 23, 27, 28, 29, 30, 78, 81.
See also textual primacy of F1; and under publication price of F1 and refurbishment of F1, 18c
F1 owner, 25
his library, 25, 35
letter to Isaac Reed. -/n78 and 232
Sterling, Sir Louis (collector), 168
Swift, Jonathan, his library, 28
— T —
tabular presentation of costs. See under costs to produce and distribute
Taylor, Gary, 21, 22, 298. -/n55
on facsimile editions, 324
Tenn University-n47, 187
tercentenary of F1. See centennial of F1
textual primacy of F1. -/n63
mid-18c, its recognition a turning point, 24
not recognised in 17c, 22
recognised by Steevens, Johnson and Tooke, 24
Theobald, Lewis, 25, 27, 28, 78. -/n232
F1 owner, 25
Thoms & Eron (booksellers), 316
time spans for price trends. See under price analysis
Tomsk 'copy', 300
Tonson, Jacob (publisher)
monopoly, with family successors, on Shakespeare publications, 18c, 22
owned the copyrights, chose the editors, 22
Tooke, John Home, and textual primacy of F1, 24
Tout (binder), 119, 123, 213
trade sales, 74
Longmans and Aaron Ward catalogues-n228, 74
Turburt, G M R, 185, 292
type, pica, effect of its smallness on F1 composing cost, 8
— U —
unfound copies of F1, 313–19. -/n18
definition of 'unfound', 275, 313
un traced copies of F1. -/n18
definition of 'untraced', 275, 319
— V —
Valladolid 'copy', 230, 300. -/n8
variants. See press-variants
Vincent F1. See West 58 (Vincent)
— W —
watermarks, 166. and see Plate 6
Webster, Paul Webster, 202
Wells, Gabriel (bookseller), 50, 104, 112, 113, 115, 116, 117, 118, 200, 263, 321. -/n63
bought much Shakespeare for Folger-n188, 52
important F1 bookseller, 52
sale to Folger of Folger 82, 283
Wells, Stanley, 298
Werstine, Paul, iv
call for a new census, 285
pursuit of F1 press-variants, 298
West 13 (British Library), 63
West 20 (Capell, Trinity College), 25
West 22. (Senate House), 34, 292. See also under America, F1 in
West 31 (Bodleian), 14, 15, 109, 292. See also under Bodleian Library; Davis, Richard.
Madan, Turburt, Gibson book on-n148, 44
world of book sales, 19c, 33-35. See also under libraries

enthusiasm for collecting, 33

growth in book sales, 33

increasing importance of booksellers. See also Lilly, Quaritch

late 19c, FIs increasingly less available, 36

market for FI, discriminating, 61

Roxburgh Club, 33

sale of great libraries, 33

shift to literary criteria in book-collecting, 33

world of FI, 20c, 5, 41-48. See also under

auction houses, central role in exchange of FIs; censuses of FI; display and exhibitions of FI, 20c; FI's 20c role, general examples; facsimile editions; Folger Shakespeare Library; Folger's FI purchasing and prices paid; Lee, Sidney; libraries; new bibliography; new bibliography, FI's role in development of electronic editions of FI, 46

FI continued to make book history, 41

FI now, high reverence and high price, 67

FI now, virtually stopped trading, 67

FI pioneered use of 'census' with books-nl34, 41

F1, central role in Shakespeare scholarship, 41, 43, 48

FIIs increasingly less available, 56

Folger's purchasing one third of copies, the most significant event in FI's sales history, unique for a great book, 48

Lee's Census made FI unique, 41

list of thirty-five works on FI, no book in same league, 43. -l/n148

number of facsimiles, one measure of interest in FI, 46, 323

simultaneous publication of Lee's Census and Facsimile (1902), 41

world of Shakespeare, 5

world of Shakespeare, 17c

1659, 'nadir of Shakespeare's posthumous history', 15

his plays seemed inferior to Fletcher's and Jonson's, 22

world of Shakespeare, 18c, 22-24

'cultural presence', 5, 23

'made it to the top', 1740s-1760s, 22

interest in Shakespeare, widespread and deep, 22

first edition printed in America, 1795-96, 23

Garrick's Shakespeare Jubilee, 1769, 23

manifestations of Shakespeare's apotheosis far-reaching, 23

peak frequency in play performances, 1733-52, 23

Shakespeare Gallery, 1789, 23

world of Shakespeare, 19c, 31-33

'King Shakespeare'--Carlyle, 31

1840, Shakespeare Society, 31

1874, New Shakespeare Society, 31

beginning of Shakespeareana collecting in America, 33, 35

depth of his penetration into the minds of Hazlitt, Keats, Byron, Freud, Marx-n92, 31

facsimile editions of FI, 32
fame of Shakespearean actors and actresses, 32
new critical attention, 31
plays frequently performed, even in 'spare
times for Shakespeare', 32
Wren, Walter, 162

— Y —
Yushodo (booksellers), 196, 199, 202, 209, 214,
224, 269. -7/n26

— Z —
Zaehnsdorf (binder), 112, 115, 117, 119, 209